॥ रसो वै सः ॥

"Raso vai saḥ"

THE NUMBER OF RASAS

BY

V. RAGHAVAN, M.A., PH.D.

Department of Sanskrit, University of Madras

WITH A FOREWORD BY

PROF. M. HIRIYANNA, M.A.

Formerly Professor of Sanskrit, Maharajah's College, Mysore

THE ADYAR LIBRARY, ADYAR

1940

Printed by
C. SUBBARAYUDU,
AT THE VASANTA PRESS,
ADYAR, MADRAS.

FOREWORD

I GLADLY respond to the desire of Dr. Raghavan that I should contribute a Foreword to this book. He has been carrying on researches in the field of Sanskrit literary criticism for several years past, and the material which he has brought together here shows how extensive is his acquaintance with the literature on the subject. He draws his data, it will be seen, from unpublished manuscripts as readily as he does from published works. The opinion formed on any aspect of the subject by one, who has devoted so much time to its study and whose knowledge of it is so wide, is of special value and deserves the careful attention of all scholars.

The particular problem considered here is that of the number of *rasas*, and its consideration necessarily involves the discussion of many important points relating to their nature and scope. As in the case of other problems investigated by the ancient Indians, we find here also an astounding variety of solutions. While some thinkers have held that there is but one *rasa*, others have maintained that the *rasas* are many, there being a wide divergence of opinion respecting their exact number. The usual view, however, is that there are eight *rasas* or nine, with the addition of what is termed *śānta* :

शृङ्गारहास्यकरुणा रौद्रवीरभयानकाः ।
बीभत्साद्भुतशान्ताश्च रसाः पूर्वैरुदाहृताः ॥

Although Dr. Raghavan considers all these views more or less in detail, the main part of his discussion is concerned with the admissibility of *s'ānta* as the ninth *rasa*. His treatment of the question is quite comprehensive, and he examines it both from the historical and the aesthetic sides. A brief reference to each of them may not be out of place.

Owing to the uncertainty of our knowledge of the early phases of Indian classical literature, it is not possible to say when poets began to portray this *rasa*. The ascetic and mystic elements, however, which form its distinctive basis, are very old features of Indian life; and they were highly valued by those who followed the teaching of the Veda as well as by those who did not. So we may assume that the *s'ānta* attitude found expression in literature quite early; and this is corroborated by the works of As'vaghoṣa even if, on account of its chronological indefiniteness, we leave out of consideration the Mahābhārata, the usual example given of the *s'ānta rasa*. As regards writers on Poetics, the earliest to recognise it definitely, so far as our knowledge at present goes, was Udbhaṭa. Possibly its recognition by them was even earlier. Bharata's view in the matter is somewhat doubtful, by reason of the unsatisfactory character of the text of the *Nāṭyas'āstra* as it has come down to us. Some manuscripts of it mention only eight *rasas*, but others nine. The weight of evidence bearing on the point seems, on the whole, to be on the former side; and Dr. Raghavan adduces several convincing arguments to show that the references to this *rasa* in Bharata are all spurious. But it should be added that the *Nāṭyas'āstra* contains nearly all the essential points necessary for a theoretical formulation of it.

Before we pass on to the aesthetic aspect of the question, it is desirable to distinguish the emotive content or theme of

a literary work from the aesthetic sentiment which, according to the prevalent Indian view, its idealised representation evokes in the reader or the spectator. Thus in the case of the *S'ākuntalam*, Duṣyanta's love for S'akuntalā forms the chief theme while the emotion, which it awakens in us as we witness the drama enacted, is *s'ṛṅgāra*. When we ask whether *s'ānta* can be a *rasa*, we mean whether situations in life involving the quietistic sentiment lend themselves to be similarly dealt with in literature. If they do, then *s'ānta* is a *rasa*; otherwise, it is not. The practice of great poets like Kālidāsa, which is after all the true touchstone in such matters, shows that *s'ānta* situations can certainly be thus delineated in literary works. In the last act of his play, just alluded to, Kālidāsa describes the tranquillity and holiness of Mārīca's hermitage in a manner which affects us most profoundly. But, however splendidly depicted, the *s'ānta rasa* occupies only a subordinate place there; and a doubt may therefore arise whether it can be the leading sentiment in a work, *i.e.* whether it can be portrayed in such a manner that it will impress us at the end as the predominant element in the unity of *rasas* which, according to the Indian view, every work of art is expected to achieve. Some of the works of As'vaghoṣa, to whom I have already referred, show that it can be so represented. The Mahābhārata also, at any rate in its present form, illustrates the same truth, as set forth by Ānandavardhana in his masterly way in the last section of his *Dhvanyāloka*.

Yet there were theorists who denied that the *s'ānta* could be an art emotion. It is hardly necessary to examine their arguments when we have the practice of great poets and the opinion of great art critics to the contrary. But a reference should be made to one of them which appears, at first sight, to possess some force. This argument is that the attitude of

mind for which *s'ānta* stands is altogether a rare one, and that its representation in art cannot therefore appeal to more than a very few. The objection, it is obvious, is based on the supposition that the test of true art is in the wideness of its appeal. The advocates of *s'ānta* brush this argument aside usually by saying that such questions are not to be decided by a plebiscite; but, by thus admitting the narrowness of its appeal, they seem to give up their position. Their conclusion that *s'ānta* is a *rasa* is irresistible. Indeed, it would have been a strange irony of circumstance if Indians, of all, had excluded it from the sphere of art. The way in which this particular objection is met, however, is not satisfactory. May it be that the contention that the appeal of *s'ānta* is only to a very few is wrong? No unwonted occasion in life—whether it be one of joy or one of sorrow—passes without bringing home to man the supreme desirability of spiritual peace. It means that the need for such peace is fundamental to the human heart; and this conclusion is confirmed by the pure satisfaction which the contemplation, for example, of the images of Buddha in meditative repose brings to so many. If so, the *s'ānta* mood is by no means uncommon; and the *s'ānta rasa* need not be an exception to the rule that the appeal of art is general. What is uncommon is the capacity in man to capture that mood and cultivate it, so that it may come to prevail over all other moods; but this deficiency does not matter so far as art is concerned for it has the power, of itself, to enable him to attain, albeit only for a while, the peace of spirit which, as an old Indian critic has observed, even a *yogin* has to strain himself long to win.

Dr. Raghavan makes a valuable contribution to the study not merely of Sanskrit literary criticism but of Indian Aesthetics as a whole, for the conception of *rasa*, though it is

here dealt with chiefly in its relation to poetry, is general and furnishes the criterion by which the worth of all forms of fine art may be judged. I have no doubt that the book will be read and appreciated very widely.

M. H.

PREFACE

RASA, Aucitya and Dhvani form the three great contributions of Sanskrit Alaṁkāra S'āstra to the subject of Literary Criticism. Rasa is the very 'soul' (Ātman) of poetry and drama. Of this concept of Rasa, one aspect namely the number of the Rasas—whether they are only the eight mentioned by Bharata or are more—is studied in the following pages. The study now and then does necessarily touch more fundamental aspects of the concept of Rasa also.

This study was originally published in the form of articles in the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras. It was suggested to me that I might bring them out in book-form. That they have appeared now in book-form is due to the kindness of Dr. Srinivasa Murti, Director, Adyar Library, to whom my thanks are due for the inclusion of this publication in the Adyar Library Series. I must thank also Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, D. Phil., Reader in Sanskrit, University of Madras and Curator, Adyar Library.

Thanks are also due to the authorities of the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras, and to the authorities of the University of Madras for permitting this publication.

Madras
29-7-40

V. RAGHAVAN

SYNOPSIS

I

The Advent of S'ānta

Bharata mentioned only eight Rasas and Kālidāsa knew only eight Rasas. Daṇḍin describes and illustrates only eight Rasas. (p. 1) Bharata says that S'ṛṅgāra etc. are the eight Rasas mentioned by Brahman. What is the significance of the mention of Brahman here ? (p. 2) The names Brahmā, Sadās'iva, Bharata and Taṇḍu in the history of Nāṭya literature. (pp. 2-5) The question whether Taṇḍu and Nandikes'vara are identical. (pp. 5-8) Rājas'ekhara's reference to Nandikes'vara as the first exponent of Rasas and its explanation. (pp. 8-9) Vāsuki the first to speak of the S'ānta rasa according to S'āradātanaya. (pp. 11-12) Kohala and S'ānta. (p. 12) The questions which arise regarding the S'ānta rasa. (pp. 13-14)

II

The Controversy over S'ānta

Bharata did not mention the S'ānta rasa ; the S'ānta texts in Bharata are interpolations. (pp. 15-16) But ideas related to S'ānta are present in Bharata's accepted text ; passages recognising the quietistic element, in Bharata. (pp. 16-20) The real nature of Bharata's drama is secular as Abhinava

also explains in his commentary. The incoming of S'ānta stage by stage. The view of the Candrikā on the Dhvanyāloka that S'ānta can only be the secondary motive. (pp. 20-21)

Probably the Buddhists and the Jains were responsible for making S'ānta the ninth Rasa. The Saundarananda kāvya, the S'āriputra prakaraṇa and the fragment of an allegorical drama of As'vaghoṣa. The Jain Anuyogadvāra sūtra of the fifth cent. A. D. mentions the S'ānta rasa. The probable theorist who might have introduced the S'ānta rasa : Rāhula ? S'rīharṣa the Vārttikakāra ? It is likely that it was the play Nāgānanda which was responsible for starting the discussion on S'ānta. (pp. 21-24)

The objections to S'ānta becoming a Rasa and the replies to those objections. (pp. 24-30) Literature depicting S'ānta, Kāvyas and Nāṭakas. (pp. 30-42)

The writers who accept S'ānta and those who reject it (pp. 42-47) ; the view that it is admissible in Kāvya but not in drama (pp. 47-8) ; the view that S'ānta is a Rasa but can be included in one of the eight old Rasas (the Antarbhāva vāda). (pp. 48-9)

The Ālambana vibhāva, the Uddīpana vibhāva, Daivata, Varṇa, Vṛtti and Guṇa of S'ānta. Haripāla's Brāhmī vṛtti for his Brāhma rasa, the counterpart of the S'ānta rasa. (pp. 49-52)

III

Some Peculiar and Original Views on S'ānta

The peculiar and original view on S'ānta in the (i) Rasa Kalikā of Rudra bhaṭṭa, (2) Saṁgīta sudhākara of Haripāladeva, (3) Prapañca hṛdaya and (4) Anuyogadvāra Sūtra (Jain). (pp. 53-58)

IV

The Sthāyin of S'ānta

Discussion of the several Sthāyi bhāvas proposed for the S'ānta rasa ; S'ama, Samyagjñāna, Tṛṣṇākṣayasukha, Sarvacittavṛttipras'ama, nirvis'eṣa cittavṛtti, Dhṛti, Nirveda, Utsāha, Jugupsā, Rati, Any one of the remaining Sthāyins, All the eight Sthāyins together, and Ātman or Ātmajñāna or Tattvajñāna.

S'ānta the basis of all Rasas. (pp. 59-90)

V

The Text of the Abhinavabhāratī on the S'ānta rasa (corrected) (pp. 91-106).

VI

Other Rasas

Preyas, Vātsalya and Bhakti ; their Sthāyins ; controversy over these Rasas. (pp. 107-112)

Sneha, S'raddhā, Laulya, Mṛgayā, Akṣa and other Rasas. (pp. 112-114) Lollaṭa's view that Rasas are innumerable, as cited in the Abhinavabhāratī. Rasatva for all Vyabhicārins and even Sāttvikas,—the view of Rudraṭa and Namisādhu. Pratīhārendurāja's acceptance of this view. The restriction of Rasatva to eight or nine is ' conventional ' almost. The mention of the possibility of additional Rasas,—Laulya, Sneha, Vyasana, Duḥkha and Sukha, in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa. Vyābhicāritva and and Sthāyitva names of stages, rather than of a fixed set of Bhāvas. (pp. 115-120)

Bhoja's view of Rasa in S. K. Ā. and S'ṛ. Pra. His Udātta and Uddhata Rasas; his acceptance of S'ānta and Preyas. These four Rasas are accepted for the four types of hero, Udātta, Uddhata, Lalita and S'ānta. His acceptance of Rudraṭa's position; not only Vyabhicārins and Sāttvikas, but many other states like Svātantrya and Pāravas'ya are considered as Rasas by Bhoja. The largest number of Rasas to be seen in Bhoja. The accommodation of this view in his main theory of one Ahaṅkāra Rasa. Bhoja's critique of the old view that only a few, Rati etc., are Sthāyins. (pp. 120-125) A state of chaos in the world of Rasa, recorded by Abhinava in his Locana. (pp. 125-126)

Criticism of the above view; clear statement of the theory of Sthāyibhāva and Rasa, according to Bharata and Abhinava. (pp. 126-128) Jagannātha Paṇḍita proposing to stick to Bharata to avoid a complete overhauling of the system. (pp. 128-9)

Bhakti and Madhura Rasa; the Vaiṣṇava Ālaṁkārikas of Bengal (pp. 129-132); Madhusūdana Sarasvatī on Bhakti Rasa. (pp. 132-137)

The Māyā Rasa,—Bhānudatta and Cirañjīvibhaṭṭācārya (pp. 138-140); the Kārpaṇya Rasa. (p. 140)

The Vrīḍanaka Rasa in the Anuyogadvāra Sūtra and its commentary by Maladhāri Hemacandra. (pp. 140-143)

VII

The Varieties of the same Rasa

1. King Haripāla's three different Rasas, S'ṛṅgāra Sambhoga and Vipralambha; the question of Rasābhāsa and the question whether all Rasas are pleasurable; Vidyādhara *versus* S'iṅgabhūpāla on Rasābhāsa; the Rasakalikā holding some Rasas to be painful. (pp. 144-150)

2. The varieties of Hāsya, Karuṇa, Bhayānaka, Bībhatsa, and Adbhuta. (pp. 150-1)

3. The varieties of Vīra,—Dāna-, Dharma-, and Yuddha-Vīras; Dayā Vīra; Jagannātha on the possibility of numerous other Vīras. The Anuyogadvāra on Vīra and its varieties, (pp. 151-153)

4. Mātṛgupta on the three forms of all Rasas, Vācika, Nepathyaja and Svābhāvika. (p. 153)

5. Dharma S'ṛṅgāra, Artha S'ṛṅgāra and Kāma S'ṛṅgāra in Bharata; Mokṣa S'ṛṅgāra also in Bhoja. (pp. 153-4)

VIII

Are All Rasas Pleasurable?

Are all Rasas pleasurable or are there some which are painful? The Nāṭyadarpaṇa and the Rasakalikā hold that some are painful. (pp. 155-6) Madhusūdana Sarasvatī's consideration of the question of bliss in Rasa from the viewpoints of the Sāṁkhya and the Vedānta. All Rasas are pleasurable. (pp. 156-7)

IX

New Vyabhicārins and Sāttvikas

Examination of the three categories of Bhāvas distinguished as Sthāyin, Vyabhicārin and Sāttvika. Reduction of the Vyabhicārins and additions to the same. (pp. 158-9) The distinction into Vyabhicārins and Sāttvikas. The addition to

the set 'Bhāva, Hāva etc.' by Rāhula, Padmas'rī, Bhoja and Vis'vanātha. Bhānudatta's inclusion of the ten Madana-avasthās in Vyabhicārins. (p. 159) Bhānudatta's new Vyabhicārin, Chala. (p. 160) The meaning of the name Sāttvika. Bhānudatta's additional Sāttvika, Jṛmbhā. Bhānudatta's distinction Bhāva × Ceṣṭā. (pp. 160-2)

X

Rasa-synthesis

Attempts at postulating one Rasa as the Prakṛti and the rest as Vikṛtis. (p. 163) The Karuṇa-synthesis and Bhavabhūti. (pp. 163-5) The S'ānta-synthesis of Abhinavagupta. (pp. 165-7) The Ahaṅkāra-S'ṛṅgāra-synthesis of Bhoja. (pp. 167-9) The Preman-synthesis of Bhoja. (pp. 169-170) The Rati-S'ṛṅgāra-synthesis in the Agni purāṇa. (pp. 170-1) The Adbhuta-synthesis of Nārāyaṇa. (pp. 171-5) Criticism of attempts at such synthesis. (p. 175)

Rasa as such is only one. (pp. 176-9)

ABBREVIATIONS AND SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Of Sanskrit Works only some are included here for elucidating the abbreviations; for the rest, see Index of Sanskrit Works and Authors)

Abhi. Bhā. = Abhinavabhāratī, Abhinavagupta's commentary on the Nāṭya s'āstra

Adyar = A Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the Adyar Library. 2 Parts

A. K., A. Kaus., Alaṁ. Kaus. = Alaṁkārakaustubha of Kavikarṇapūra

Alwar = A Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Library of H. H. the Mahārāja of Alwar. Dr. Peter Peterson

A. P. = Agni Purāṇa

(Sir) Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes (III)

Auf. = Th. Aufrecht's Catalogus Catalogorum

Bhā. Pra. = Bhāva Prakās'a of S'āradātanaya

Bom. Br. R. A. S. = A Descriptive Catalogue of Saṅskṛta and Prākṛta MSS. in the Library of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. Prof. H. D. Velankar

Br. Mu. Ptd. Bks. Cat. = Catalogue of Sanskrit, Pāli and Prākṛt (Printed) Books in the British Museum

Bruchstucke buddhistischer Dramen. Prof. H. Lüders. 1911

Cat. = Catalogue

Catalogue of the Collections of MSS. deposited in the Deccan College, (Poona). S. R. Bhandarkar

Catalogue of MSS. from Gujarath, Kacchch, Sindh and Khandes. G. Bühler. 4 Parts

Catalogue Sommaire Des Manuscrits Sanscrits Et Pālis. A. Cabaton. Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris. 3 Parts

Com. = Commentary

CPB. Hiralal = Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prākṛt MSS. in the Central Provinces and Berar. Rai Bahadur Hiralal

Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Vaṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣat, Calcutta. Prof. Chintaharan Chakravarti, M.A.

Dhva. Ā. = Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana

D. R. = Das'arūpaka of Dhanañjaya

D. R. A. = Das'arūpakāvaloka of Dhanika

Gaek. edn. / GOS } = Gaekward Oriental Series Edition

Granthanāmāvali. Ailak Pannalal Digambar Jain Sarasvati Bhavan, Jhalrapatan

History of Indian Literature. Dr. M. Winternitz. English Translation. Calcutta University. Part Two

History of Sanskrit Literature. Dr. A. B. Keith

Hpr. Notices II Series = Notices of Sanskrit MSS. Second Series. Mm. Haraprasad Sastri

Hpr. Report 1895-1900 = Report for the Search of Sanskrit MSS. 1895-1900. Mm. Haraprasad Sastri

IHQ = Indian History Quarterly, Calcutta

Introduction (on the History of Alaṁkāra S'āstra) to an Edition of the Sāhitya Darpaṇa. P. V. Kane

IO = Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prākṛt MSS. in the Library of the India Office. 2 Parts

Jaina Granthāvali

JOR. = Journal of Oriental Research, Madras

Journal of the Assam Research Society

Journal of the Music Academy, Madras

JRAS. = Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, London

K. A. = { Kāvyālaṁkāra of Bhāmaha / „ „ Rudraṭa / Kāvyānus'āsana of Hemacandra }

K. Ā. = Kāvyādars'a of Daṇḍin

K. A. S. S. = Kāvyālaṁkāra sāra saṁgraha of Udbhaṭa

K. M. = Kāvya mīmāṁsā of Rājas'ekhara

K. M. Edn. = Kāvyamālā Edition

K. Pra. = Kāvyaprakās'a of Mammaṭa

Mad. MS. = MS. in the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library.

MDSC = Descriptive Sanskrit Catalogues of the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library.

M. S. = Madhusūdana Sarasvatī

MTSC = Triennial Sanskrit Catalogues of the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library

Mysore = Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the Govt. Oriental Library, Mysore. 2 Parts

N. D. = Nāṭya Darpaṇa of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra

Notices, Mitra = Notices of Sanskrit MSS. by Dr. Rajendralal Mitra

N. S'. = Nāṭya s'āstra of Bharata

N. S. = Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay

N. W. Provinces Cat. = A Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in Private Libraries of the North Western Provinces

Oppert = List of Sanskrit MSS. in Private Libraries of Southern India by Gustav Oppert. 2 Parts

Oxford = Catalogus Codicum Sanscriticorum Bibliothecae Bodlienae. Th. Aufrecht

Peterson = Reports of Operations in Search of Sanskrit MSS. in the Bombay Circle. Dr. Peter Peterson. (6 Reports)

R. A. S. = Rasārṇavasudhākara of S'iṅgabhūpāla

Report of a Second Tour in Search of Sanskrit MSS. made in Rajputana and Central India in 1904-6. S. R. Bhandarkar

R. G. = Rasagaṅgādhara of Jagannātha

Rice = Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in Mysore and Coorg. L. Rice

R. T. = Rasa Taraṅgiṇī of Bhānudatta

S'āk. = S'ākuntala of Kālidāsa

Sāṁ. Kārikā = Sāṁkhya Kārikā of Īs'varakṛṣṇa

S. D. = Sāhitya Darpaṇa of Vis'vanātha

S. K. Ā. = Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa of Bhoja

S. M. = Sāhitya Mīmāṁsā
S'ṛ. = S'ṛṅgāra
S'ṛ. Pra. = S'ṛṅgāra Prakās'a of Bhoja
S. R. = S'aṅgīta Ratnākara of S'ārṅgadeva
Stein = Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Raghunatha Temple Library of H. H. the Maharaja of Jammu and Kasmir. M. A. Stein
Studies in the History of Sanskrit Poetics. 2 Parts. Dr. S. K. De
Tanjore New Cat. = Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Tanjore Maharaja Serfoji's Sarasvatī Mahal Library, Tanjore
Travancore Curator's List = Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. collected by the Curator for the publication of Sanskrit MSS., Trivandrum
TSS = Trivandrum Sanskrit Series
U. R. C. / U. R. Carita = Uttararāma carita of Bhavabhūti
Vyā. = Vyākhyā

ERRATA

Page	Line	Read
7	1	S'abdakalpadruma
8	25	Tāṇḍava
12	2	texts of Vāsuki
	15	निर्वेदो
23	32	" Sarva rasa sāra "
31	25	Anukramaṇikāparvan
32	16	—बुद्धिना
35	30	Lüders
38	28	1895
43	18	Kāvyamīmāṁsā
65	26	Sāhityamimāṁsā
69	24	Bharata
72	7	Nirveda
82	13	तत्प्रकारानेव
84	21	S. R.
113	26	Rasas
120	9	' Vis'eṣas '
124	32	Nāṭya darpaṇa
125	13	' Rasānvayavibhūtis '
134	11	Contact
139	10-11	—सांप्रदायिकैरपि
151	27	N. S'.
152	10	Rasataraṅgiṇī
169	20	Pūrvā

ADDENDUM

P. 50, lines 6-7 and 26-7, Alaṁkāra sarvasva of Harsopādhyāya (?), MS. in the Madras Govt. MSS. Library, R. No. 3325 :—R. No. 5225 is another MS. of the same work in the same library in which Aubhalārya Kṛṣṇa of Devarakoṇḍa is given as the author.

THE NUMBER OF RASAS

I

FOR long, the Rasas were only eight in number. The text of the Nāṭya s'āstra of Bharata originally spoke only of eight Rasas. For a long time, the poets also were speaking only of eight Rasas. Kālidāsa says in his Vikramorvas'īya :

मुनिना भरतेन यः प्रयोगो भवतीष्वष्टरसाश्रयो नियुक्तः ।
ललिताभिनयं तमद्य भर्ता मरुतां द्रष्टुमनाः सलोकपालः ॥ II, 18.

Vararuci's Ubhayābhisārikā has occasion to mention Rasas and their number. The context is a dramatic contest. The Viṭa praises one of the courtezans who is going to enact 'Purandaravijaya' in the temple of Indra at Kusumapura. Rasas are here mentioned as eight in number.

यस्यास्तावत् प्रथमं रूपश्रीनवयौवनद्युतिकान्त्यादीनां गुणानां सम्पत्, चतुर्विधाभिनयसिद्धिः, द्वात्रिंशद्विधो हस्तप्रचारः, अष्टादशविधं निरीक्षणम्, षट् स्थानानि, गतिद्वयम् (-त्रयम्), **अष्टौ रसाः,** त्रयो गीतवादित्रादि-लया, इत्येवमादीनि नृत्ताङ्गानि त्वदाश्रयेण अलंकृतानि ।

p. 13, Caturbhāṇī, Madras.

On the side of the theorists, the writers on Poetics, Rasas were only eight upto the time of Daṇḍin who briefly describes and illustrates only the eight Rasas. Naturally, we suppose

that Bhāmaha also knew only eight Rasas. These eight Rasas are thus given by Bharata :

श्रृङ्गार-हास्य-करुण-रौद्र-वीर-भयानकाः ।
बीभत्साद्भुत संज्ञौ चेत्यष्टौ नाट्ये रसाः स्मृताः ।
एते ह्यष्टौ रसाः प्रोक्ता द्रुहिणेन महात्मना ॥

N. S'. K. M. Edn., VI, 15-16.

And their Sthāyins are thus given :

रतिर्हासश्च शोकश्च क्रोधोत्साहौ भयं तथा ।
जुगुप्सा विस्मयश्चेति स्थायिभावाः प्रकीर्तिताः ॥ *Ibid.*, VI, 17.

We are unable to fix the exact significance of the record here made by Bharata that these are the eight Rasas expounded by the great Brahman. The mention of Brahman may after all refer only to the legendary background which the Nāṭya s'āstra has created for itself. The very first verse says to the effect that *almost* the first exponent of the Nāṭya s'āstra is Brahman :

नाट्यशास्त्रं प्रवक्ष्यामि ब्रह्मणा यदुदाहृतम् । I, 1.

And this Brahman himself learnt from S'iva. This legend is settled in later times and is mentioned by all writers. How far is this based on evidences within the Nāṭya s'āstra itself ?

To begin with, sage Bharata says that Brahman himself contemplated and created out of the four Vedas, the fifth Veda called the Nāṭya Veda. I, 16-19. S'iva is mentioned in the first chapter, for the first time, with reference to the Kais'ikī Vṛtti. Brahman says that the beautiful, graceful and delicate Kais'ikī cannot be properly presented by male actors, that it can be properly done only by actresses and that he has seen it depicted by only one among males, *viz.*, God S'iva. I, 45.

We hear of S'iva again only in Ch. IV. The first drama 'Asuravijaya' or 'Amṛtamathana'[1] was enacted before an audience of Devas and Asuras in Devaloka during the Indradhvaja festival. I, 54-57.

तदन्तेऽनुकृतिर्बद्धा यथा दैत्याः सुरैर्जिताः ।

After this Samavakāra, the first drama to be staged, was finished, Brahman one day took Bharata and his troupe to Kailāsa to give a performance before God S'iva. This Samavakāra, and a Ḍima called Tripuradāha, one of S'iva's own exploits, were staged there. IV, 5-10. After the drama was finished, S'iva praised Brahman and the actors and told them that the beautiful and varied Karaṇas and Aṅgahāras of the Tāṇḍava dance which He himself did every evening might be introduced into the Pūrvaraṅga of their drama, so that their plain (S'uddha) Pūrvaraṅga might become a Citrapūrvaraṅga. IV, 11-15. He called upon one of his Gaṇas, Taṇḍu, to teach Bharata the Aṅgahāras and Karaṇas of Tāṇḍava. IV, 17-18. Thus S'iva is the God of dance proper, while Brahman himself created Drama and won S'iva's appreciation for his creation of this art. Bharata is the first artiste whom Brahman chose for the exposition of the art that he created. Brahman's creation of the art of Drama referred to all parts of it, the text of the drama, the acting of it, the music that supported the performance and finally the Rasa which the above three evoked in the hearts of the audience. This is the meaning of the verse :

जग्राह पाठ्यमृग्वेदात् सामभ्यो गीतमेव च ।
यजुर्वेदादभिनयान् रसानाथर्वणादपि ॥

[1] It is this Amṛtamathana that Kālidāsa makes into the Lakṣmīsvayamvara in his Vikramorvas'īya.

The story given above points to the historical fact that Dance existed first and that Drama was then created. Taṇḍu signifies the link between the two. The gods of the two, Dance and Drama, are S'iva and Brahman. So it is that Bharata, who represents the operatic dance-drama, says at the beginning—

प्रणम्य शिरसा देवौ **पितामहमहेश्वरौ** ।

and Abhinava adds here, in his commentary—

"एको (ब्रह्मा) विजिगीषुर्नाट्यप्रवर्तयितेति देवः । भगवांस्तु आनन्दनिर्भरतया क्रीडाशीलः सन्ध्यादौ नृत्यतीति **नाट्ये तदुपस्कारिणि च नृत्ते** तदुपज्ञं प्रवृत्तिरिति तावेवात्र अधिदैवतं गुरू चेति नमस्कार्यौ ।"

p. 2, Gaek. Edn., Vol. I.

Thus S'iva's contribution is Dance which served to beautify Drama—**तदुपस्कारिणि च नृत्ते.** Brahman's contribution itself was self-sufficient for Drama. He spoke of Text, Action, Music and Rasa. It is to this part of the Drama of Brahman that Bharata refers in Ch. VI, when he says that these are the eight Rasas *spoken of by Brahman.*

एते ह्यष्टौ रसाः प्रोक्ता **द्रुहिणेन** महात्मना ।

It is on this text that S'āradātanaya relies when he says that, according to Brahman, Rasas are only eight, and the ninth, the S'ānta, is impossible.

. . . . . . तस्माच्छान्तस्य नोद्भवः ।
तस्मान्नाट्यरसा अष्टाविति **पद्मभुवो** मतम् ॥

Bhā. Pra. II, pp. 46-7.

These bits of legend have to be connected with some facts available to us, *viz.*, that there are really big works on Nāṭya which are current as works of S'iva or Sadās'iva and Brahman. Says Mr. M. R. Kavi in his Introduction to his edition of the N. S'. with the Abhi. Bhā. in the Gaek. Series :—"We have fragments of both Brahmabharata and Sadās'ivabharata." Abhinava himself refers to the three authorities, Sadās'iva, Brahman and Bharata.

"एतेन सदाशिवब्रह्मभरतमतत्रयविवेचनेन ब्रह्ममतसारताप्रति-पादनाय etc." p. 8.

The upshot of the discussion here gives the noteworthy fact that, of the three works Sadās'iva Bharata, Brahma Bharata and Bharata's Nāṭya s'āstra, the Brahma Bharata is the best and most important according to some. The Das'arūpakakārikās, IV, 38 and 39, proving Rasa to be Sāmājikās'raya, are quoted and attributed to Sadās'iva by S'āradātanaya. Bhā. Pra. VI, p. 152. This ascription does not seem to be reliable. The argumentative style of the Kārikās argue for a later writer. Whether this particular ascription be true or not, it can be accepted that old works in the name of Sadās'iva and Brahman exist. Though from the internal evidence of the Nāṭya s'āstra of Bharata we know of S'iva as having contributed Dance only, there may be a Sadās'iva Bharata dealing with all departments of Nāṭya. It is also likely that this Sadās'iva Bharata is of special importance for its chapters on Dance, on Tāṇḍava, its Karaṇas and Aṅgahāras.

Similarly Taṇḍu, who, in the Nāṭya s'āstra, simply passes the Tāṇḍava from S'iva to Bharata, may have some old Nāṭya work to his credit. There is some difficulty in understanding the name Taṇḍu. In Ch. I, we hear of a Taṇḍu who is one of the hundred sons of Bharata. (I, 26.) From Ch. IV, we know him as belonging to S'iva's camp. In Ch. I, 26, the text has a variant (p. 18. Gaek. edn. fn.) Tāṇḍya, and in

Ch. IV, 17 and 18, we have the variant Tāṇḍin (p. 19, Gaek. edn. fn.). Abhinava says that the reading 'Taṇḍu' is appropriate, in view of that word's suitability to the derivation of the word Tāṇḍava.

"सर्वत्र पाठे तण्डुशब्द एव युक्तः, ताण्डवशब्दव्युत्पत्तिवशात् ।"

p. 90, Gaek. Edn., Vol. I.

It looks as if 'Taṇḍu' was created out of the word Tāṇḍava. Surely, this Tāṇḍava was being done by S'iva before Taṇḍu who, on S'iva's bidding, taught it to Bharata. Therefore, the name Tāṇḍava could not have been the name given to the dance subsequent to Taṇḍu imparting it to Bharata. In this connection, the text of Abhinava's commentary seems to say that this Taṇḍu is none else than Nandin, the chief attendant of S'iva. We find in Mr. M. R. Kavi's Edn., Vol. I, p. 90: 'तण्डुमुनिशब्दौ (नन्दिभर) तयोरपरनामनी ।' But in the MS. of the Abhinavabhāratī in the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library, we find the passage running thus:

'तण्डुमुनिशब्दौ तस्योरेव (?) नामनि (नी)' । Vol. I, 68.

and it is rather difficult to reconstruct or understand this text. There does not seem to be unanimity among writers regarding the identity of Taṇḍu and Nandin. The S'abdakalpadruma says that, according to Halāyudha, Taṇḍu is a door-keeper of S'iva,—S'ivadvārapālavis'eṣa. The Vācaspatya says the same thing and adds that it is a name of Nandikes'vara 'शिवद्वारपालविशेषे, नन्दिकेश्वरे' । 'नन्दी भृङ्गिरिटिस्तण्डुः' ।[1] In the

S'abdakalpadurma, we find that according to the Trikāṇḍas'eṣa, the other names of Nandikes'vara are Nandī, S'ālaṅkāyana and *Tāṇḍavatālika*, and that according to Hemacandra, the other names are Nandī and *Taṇḍu*. Kes'ava's Kalpadrukos'a (Gaek. edn., p. 392, S'l. 117-8) gives Nandin, S'ālaṅkāyana, *Tāṇḍavatālika*, *Taṇḍu*, Kelīkila and Kūṣmāṇḍaka as the other names of Nandikes'vara. If Taṇḍu were a name of Nandikes'vara, he would be both the time-keeper for S'iva's Tāṇḍava (ताण्डवतालिक) and the promulgator of the Tāṇḍava (तण्डुना प्रोक्तं ताण्डवम्). But, according to Sarvānanda and Bharatamallika, the person who is responsible for the S'āstra through which Tāṇḍava got its name, is a *sage* (Muni) named Tāṇḍa or Tāṇḍya. And Taṇḍu whom S'iva asked to teach the Tāṇḍava to Bharata may not be Nandikes'vara but may be some other Gaṇa of S'iva. Ratnākara's Haravijaya, which is a store-house of information for the Nāṭya-researcher, mentions Nandīs'a and Taṇḍu as two different persons and the commentator, Rājānaka Alaka, adds that Taṇḍu is one of the Pramathagaṇas of S'iva.

[1] The explanation of Tāṇḍava by Taṇḍu is not the only explanation. Bhānuji and Kṣirasvāmin, in their commentaries on the Amarakos'a (Nāṭya varga, S'l. 10) give Tāṇḍava as being so called after its exponent, Taṇḍu. Bharata (com. on Amara) says that the *sage* Tāṇḍa (not Nandikes'vara, a S'ivagaṇa) promulgated the S'āstra which came to be called after him 'Tāṇḍi' (Neuter); and from this Tāṇḍi is Tāṇḍava derived. 'ताण्डेन कृतं ताण्डि, नृत्यशास्त्रम्, तदस्यास्तीति भरतः (अमरटीकायाम्) ।' See the S'abdakalpadruma and Vācaspatya on Tāṇḍava. Sarvānanda's Ṭīkāsarvasva, p. 41, T. S. S. edn., pt. 1. **ताण्ड्येन मुनिना प्रोक्तं** . . . . . . ताण्डि नृत्यशास्त्रम् । तदस्यास्तीति ताण्डवम् । To these derivations, Subhūticandra adds 'तण्डते (तण्ड्यते) भूरनेनेति ताण्डवम् ।' Tāṇḍava is so called because, being a forceful dance (Uddhata), earth is stamped heavily in it. Vidyāvinoda Nārāyaṇa gives all these explanations. Rāyamukuṭa gives Sarvānanda's and Svāmin's explanation and adds: "तडिधातोः ताण्डवमिति तु कौमुदी ।"

नन्दीशनिर्दयकराहतपुष्करेषु मन्द्रं ध्वनत्सु मुरजेषु विभज्य तण्डुः ।
आसारितेषु परिकल्पितसप्तभेदपर्याप्तशोभमथ ताण्डवमभ्यगायत् ॥
N. S. Edn., II, 20.

Com. तण्डुनामा प्रमथः । ताण्डवं नाम गीतकम् आत्मप्रोक्तम् अभ्यगायत्[1] ॥ p. 21.

From this it would appear that Nandin is the drummer and Taṇḍu the singer of the libretto for S'iva's dance. Abhinava gives an extract from Kohala also on p. 182 (Gaek. edn. Vol. I) having some bearing on Taṇḍu and Tāṇḍava.

The name Nandin is found twice in the Nāṭya s'āstra, IV, 260 and 261, in connection with the Piṇḍībandhas. More than one work on Nāṭya has come down to us as the work of Nandikes'vara. Rājas'ekhara ascribes the first treatment of Rasa to Nandikes'vara and the first treatment of Drama to Bharata.

"—रूपकनिरूपणीयं भरतः, रसाधिकारिकं नन्दिकेश्वरः— ।"
p. 1, K. M. Gaek. Edn.

The chief ground on which Rājas'ekhara foists the first treatment of Rasa on Nandikes'vara is the record made by Vātsyāyana in his Kāma sūtra, I, 1-8, that Nandikes'vara is the first author on Kāma. Love may be taken to be indicative of the other Rasas and further, it is the most important of the emotions which form the material for literature. S'āradātanaya relates a Rasa-legend in Ch. 3, of his Bhāvaprakās'a in which Nandin figures and which legend he ascribes to Vyāsa. 'व्यासप्रोक्तेन मार्गेण कथयामि यथार्थतः' । We do not yet know of a work of Vyāsa on Nāṭya. The legend given in the Bhāvaprakās'a is this: Brahman created the worlds at S'iva's bidding and then contemplated upon the past and saw with his mind's eye the doings of S'iva. Nandikes'vara appeared before Brahman at that time and taught him Nāṭya and asked him to teach the art to the Bharatas, *i.e.*, actors. Brahman created the art of representation, drama, with a past story of S'iva called Tripuradāha, a Ḍima. The Bharatas staged this Tripuradāha and while Brahman was witnessing it, there came forth from his four faces four Vṛttis with the four Rasas, S'ṛṅgāra, Vīra, Raudra and Bībhatsa. Concluding this story of Rasotpatti, S'āradātanaya says:

व्यक्ता मुखेभ्यश्चोत्पन्ना इत्यूचुः शंकरादयः ।

The S'aṅkara mentioned here is another puzzle.[1] S'āradātanaya brings Nārada also into the story and says that Nārada expounded this Rasotpatti to Bharata, the sage (p. 58, Ch. III). The two Guruparamparās found here are 'S'iva-Nandin-Brahman-the Bharatas' and 'Nārada-Bharata, the sage'. In Ch. 10, S'āradātanaya gives another story of how Nāṭya came to earth from heaven, where also the former Guru-paramparā is given. The actors, the Bharatas, are sent to this world and they write treatises on the art.

[1] Tāṇḍava thus originally meant the song, to the accompaniment of which S'iva danced; the dance then came to be called Tāṇḍava after its song. Such instances of dances getting their names from the songs, the Tāla of the song, etc., are common. *Cf.* Carcarī is a Tāla, a musical composition, a dance and also a spring festival in which the Carcarī is danced. (The Ratnāvalī, I.) *Cf.* Jatisvara, Varṇa, Pada, etc., in the modern South Indian Nautch, which names of musical compositions serve as names of the dance items also.

[1] S'aṅkara may mean S'iva himself and this would mean then that the Sadās'iva Bharata is the source of this story. A S'aṅkara is cited in Pārs'vadeva's Saṅgītasamayasāra, T. S. S. Edn, p. 42.

सकलं निष्कलं चेति वाद्यमेतत् द्विधा भवेत् ।
कथितं शंकरेणेदम् एकतन्त्रीसमाश्रयम् ॥

नाट्यवेदाच्च भरताः सारमुद्धृत्य सर्वतः ।
संग्रहं सुप्रयोगार्हं मनुना प्रार्थिता व्यधुः ॥
एकं द्वादशसाहस्रैः श्लोकैरेकं तदर्धतः ।
षड्भिः श्लोकसहस्रैर्यो नाट्यवेदस्य संग्रहः ॥

Bhā. Pra., Gaek. Edn., p. 287.

The Bharatas wrote two works, one in 12000 S'lokas and another in 6000 S'lokas. The basis of these two is the Nāṭyaveda which is perhaps double the extent of the first of these two. The second work in 6000 verses is the present Nāṭya s'āstra of Bharata and the Das'arūpakāvaloka quotes it by the name, Ṣaṭsahasrī. "षट्सहस्रीकृताप्युक्तम्—'एभ्यश्च सामान्यगुणयोगेन रसा निष्पद्यन्ते' इति ।" IV. (*Vide* Bharata's N. S'. VII, p. 80, Kās'ī Edn.) Bahurūpamis'ra has quoted the former work in 12000 verses, the Dvādas'asāhasrī, in his gloss on the Das'arūpaka.[1] Mr. M. R. Kavi quotes the Yāmalāṣṭakatantra in the preface to his edition of the Nāṭyas'āstra (Vol. I, p. 6, fn. 1.), according to which the Nāṭyaveda, which S'āradātanaya mentions as the basis of the two Saṅgrahas, is a work in 36000 S'lokas. Which of these two, the Nāṭyaveda and the Dvādas'asāhasrī, is the work of S'iva and which, of Brahman, cannot be said easily. The latter may be the Brahmabharata referred to by Abhinava. What these works say on Rasa, we are not in a position to know.

The only work we have is the Ṣaṭsahasrī of Bharata, the Nāṭyas'āstra, which says that according to Brahman, Rasas are eight. S'āradātanaya fashions this text into the form of a later controversial text, and makes Padmabhū (Brahman) refute the S'ānta and accept only eight Rasas. We can

[1] *Vide* J. O. R., Madras, Vol. VIII, pp. 329-330, my article on Bahurūpamis'ra's commentary on the Das'arūpaka.

conjecture safely that both the Sadās'ivabharata and the Brahmabharata knew only eight Rasas.

Was there any old work which expounded nine Rasas? When did the S'ānta first make its appearance? Just after giving the above-noticed view of Padmabhū that Rasas are only eight, S'āradātanaya gives another account which he attributes to Vāsuki. There seems to be, from the following verse, an old work in which Vāsuki imparts the Nāṭyas'āstra to Nārada.

उत्पत्तिस्तु रसानां या पुरा वासुकिनोदिता ।
नारदस्योच्यते सैषा प्रकारान्तरकल्पिता ॥ Bhā. Pra., p. 46.

The S'ānta Rasa is accepted in this account.

रजस्तमोविहीनात्तु सत्त्वावस्थात् सचित्ततः ।
मनागस्पृष्टबाह्यार्थात् शान्तो रस इतीरितः ॥ II, p. 48.

Who is this Vāsuki? We already know of two serpents among Saṅgītācāryas, Kambala and As'vatara and we must add to them this Nāṭyācārya Vāsuki. S'āradātanaya quotes Vāsuki earlier also (pp. 36-37) regarding the rise of Rasa from Bhāvas.

नानाद्रव्यौषधैः पाकैः व्यञ्जनं भाव्यते यथा ।
एवं भावा भावयन्ति रसानभिनयैः सह ।
इति वासुकिनाप्युक्तो भावेभ्यो रससंभवः ॥

This verse is, as pointed out by the editor of the Bhāvaprakās'a, found in the Nāṭya s'āstra of Bharata, quoted along with four other verses, with the words— 'भवन्ति चात्र श्लोकाः ।'[1]

[1] Thus, there are Anuṣṭubh and Āryā verses quoted by Bharata. These are called Ānuvaṁs'ya verses, handed down as basic and authoritative texts on Nāṭya written by other writers.

If we are to rely on S′āradātanaya, we have to suppose that the Rasa chapters in Bharata are based on the texts to Vāsuki and others and that this Vāsuki accepted a ninth Rasa, namely, the S′ānta. Why then does Bharata's text not mention the S′ānta? If Bharata did not approve of S′anta being a Rasa, he must refute it, citing Vāsuki's position. When no such controversy is seen in Bharata's Nāṭyas′āstra, we have to conclude that S′āradātanaya has only increased the confusion here, as on other topics also.

If we are to attach any weight to the statement of another late writer Dharmasūri, author of the Sāhityaratnākara, we have to suppose that Kohala is, like Vāsuki, another old writer who accepted the S′ānta Rasa. He says regarding the Sthāyin of S′ānta—

"कोहलस्तु उत्साहो वा निर्वेदा वा शमो वा अस्य स्थायीत्युवाच"

Vide D. T. Tātācārya, J. O. R., Vol. V, p. 29.

If Kohala had accepted S′ānta, Abhinava and other champions of S′ānta would have quoted him. Dharmasūri's reference to Kohala is unreliable. But it is also likely that a late work falsely ascribed to Kohala speaks of the S′ānta and Dharmasūri bases his statement on such a pseudo-Kohala work.

The Nāṭyas′astra of Bharata itself recognised only eight Rasas. Subsequently, when the S′ānta was accepted by writers, the text of the N. S′. was changed and read thus as indicated by Abhinava:

The definite authorship of these Anuṣṭubhs and Āryās is not known. Abhinava says while commenting on one set of such Ānuvaṁs′ya Āryās, on p. 328: "ता एता ह्यार्याः एकप्रघट्टकतया पूर्वाचार्यैः लक्षणत्वेन पठिताः । मुनिना तु सुखसंग्रहाय यथास्थानं निवेशिताः ।"

श्रृङ्गारहास्यकरुणाः रौद्रवीरभयानकाः ।
बीभत्साद्भुतशान्ताश्च नव नाट्ये रसाः स्मृताः ॥ N. S′., VI, 16
रतिर्हासश्च शोकश्च क्रोधोत्साहौ भयं तथा ।
जुगुप्साविस्मयशमाः स्थायिभावाः प्रकीर्तिताः ॥ N. S′., VI, 18.

"शान्तापलापिनस्त्वत्र अष्टाविति पठन्ति ।"

"तत्र शान्तस्य स्थायी 'विस्मयशमाः' इति कैश्चित् पठितः ।" *Ibid.*

Udbhaṭa recognises the S′ānta as can be seen from his Kāvyālaṅkārasārasaṅgraha. He is thus the first commentator on the N. S′. and the first Ālaṅkārika now known to have definitely begun to speak of Rasas as nine in number. So, he might have made the necessary alteration in the text of the Nāṭyas′āstra as above shown and as pointed out by Abhinava.

Regarding this subject of S′ānta Rasa, the following questions arise:

(i) Did Bharata recognise it? What are the arguments of those who hold that Bharata recognises it? What is the real position of Bharata in respect of S′ānta?

(ii) Who is the first writer who introduced the S′ānta Rasa? What was that condition in the world of letters that led to the postulation of S′ānta?

(iii) Independent of Bharata accepting it or not, what is S′ānta? Can it be a Rasa? What are the arguments of the opponents of S′ānta?

(iv) What is the criticism of those who not only accept but praise the S′ānta as the greatest Rasa? Who are these writers? What are the literary compositions that have proved the possibility of the S′ānta Rasa?

(v) Who are those who, unable to find fault with S′ānta, make a compromise, deny it in Nāṭya and accept it in Kāvya only? What are their arguments and how are they met?

(vi) Who are the writers who do not accept the S′ānta anywhere?

(vii) What is the Sthāyin of S′ānta?

These questions will be dealt with now.

II

BHARATA certainly mentioned only eight Rasas.[1] He did not give S′ānta as the ninth Rasa. The texts on S′ānta in certain recensions of Bharata's Nāṭya s′āstra must have been interpolated by advocates of S′ānta. Abhinava once argues the cause of S′ānta on the basis of these S′ānta texts available in certain recensions but he advocates its cause more vigorously earlier, quite independent of these S′ānta texts in Bharata. Abhinava even gives various arguments to show why Bharata did not speak of it at all. Further, the advocates of S′ānta who point out Nirveda or Dhṛti or any other

(vi) Who are the writers who do not accept the S'ānta anywhere ?

(vii) What is the Sthāyin of S'ānta ?

These questions will be dealt with now.

II

Bharata certainly mentioned only eight Rasas.[1] He did not give S'ānta as the ninth Rasa. The texts on S'ānta in certain recensions of Bharata's Nāṭya s'āstra must have been interpolated by advocates of S'ānta. Abhinava once argues the cause of S'ānta on the basis of these S'ānta texts available in certain recensions but he advocates its cause more vigorously earlier, quite independent of these S'ānta texts in Bharata. Abhinava even gives various arguments to show why Bharata did not speak of it at all. Further, the advocates of S'ānta who point out Nirveda or Dhṛti or any other Vyabhicārin already mentioned by Bharata as the Sthāyin of S'ānta do so only because they feel that S'ānta, its Sthāyin etc., are not given in Bharata ; hence do they resort to the Dehalīdīpanyāya, Māṅgalya-amāṅgalya etc., to read the S'ānta rasa into the text of Bharata. How they do this is discussed in the section on the Sthāyin of S'ānta below. Again, if Ānanda who speaks of S'ānta had known the S'ānta texts of Bharata and had believed in them as genuine parts of Bharata, he would have quoted them in his advocacy of S'ānta in Uddyota 3. Ānanda advocates S'ānta on his own grounds and holds as its Sthāyin neither Nirveda with all its trifling supports, nor S'ama which is given as its Sthāyin in the

[1] In the K. M. edn. of the N. S'., ch. 23, S'l. 3 has the expression '*Nava* rasās'rayam' but the correct reading here is Bhāva-rasās'rayam' as found in the Kās'ī edn. (ch. 24, S'l. 3).

interpolated S'ānta text in Bharata ; Ānanda holds as its

innocent of that part of human activity which is the sphere of

interpolated S'ānta text in Bharata; Ānanda holds as its Sthāyin 'that happiness which is the annihilation of all desires'—तृष्णाक्षयसुख.

"तृष्णानां विषयाणां यः क्षयः सर्वतोनिवृत्तिरूपो निरोधः, तदेव सुखम्" Abhinava, Locana.

All the writers who refute S'ānta are of opinion that Bharata's text does not know the S'ānta rasa. Further, Bharata gives Laya, Svara, Guṇa, Alaṁkāra, Vṛtti, Vṛtta etc., for the eight Rasas only in the several sections of his work; S'ānta is not mentioned here anywhere. This is part of the objection raised against S'ānta by its critics. They say, Bharata has related music and Rasas and has mentioned the Jātyaṅgas suggestive of the several Rasas but does not mention the S'ānta here. (*Vide* N. S'. XXIX, S'ls. 1-4.) We find in the Abhinavabhāratī:

"अनेनैव चाशयेन न शान्ते कश्चन मुनिना जात्यङ्गको विनियोक्ष्यते। तेन जात्यङ्गकविनियोगाभावात् असत्त्वमिति प्रत्युक्तम्।"

Gaek. Edn., I, p. 339.

Abhinava first argues for S'ānta not on the basis of Bharata's mention of it, but on the basis of his silence on the subject which Abhinava makes out as more eloquent. This will be explained later. Suffice to point out here that express mention of S'ānta is not found in Bharata.

If this is accepted, we can trace the way by which S'ānta slowly came to be accepted as a Rasa. We can even explore the possibilities of finding some aspects of S'ānta in Bharata's accepted text. Bharata, it must be borne in mind, handles the whole world and analyses human psychology to a great extent and it will be a wonder if he were to be entirely

innocent of that part of human activity which is the sphere of the S'ānta-rasa. The absence of S'ānta in theory does not, however, mean the absence of poetry or drama with the quietistic motif. To suppose so would be as foolish as to think that before Rasadhvani was formulated as the soul of poetry, no great poetry existed. As Ānandavardhana points out, the Rasa of the great epic, the Mahābhārata, is S'ānta. The Ṛṣi, the fourth Puruṣārtha or Mokṣa, the third and the fourth Ās'ramas of the Vānaprastha and the Saṁnyāsin—these were already parts and sublime parts of Kāvyas such as the Raghuvaṁs'a and Nāṭakas such as the S'ākuntala. Bharata, himself a sage, gave the Nāṭyas'āstra to an assemblage of sages. Bharata, therefore, could hardly have lost sight of the Ṛṣis, the forests, Tapas, etc. As a matter of fact, Bharata does mention aspects of this S'ānta-rasa and its attendant conditions.

An emotion is recognised as Rasa if it is a sufficiently permanent major instinct of man, if it is capable of being developed and delineated to its climax with its attendant and accessory feelings and if there are men of that temperament to feel imaginative emotional sympathy at the presentation of that Rasa. Thus are S'ṛṅgāra and the other seven Rasas. So, if Bharata says that drama is of a varied nature in accordance with the varied nature of the world on the one hand and of the spectators on the other, if he says that one drama predominantly develops one Rasa whose appeal is only to those whose hearts are attuned to it and if he says that a certain drama may have its theme or purpose in S'ama, it certainly means that Bharata has landed, though unconsciously, on the S'ānta rasa. Bharata says and these are surely genuine parts of the text:

क्वचिद्धर्मः क्वचित् क्रीडा क्वचिदर्थः क्वचित् शमः। I, 106.

दुःखार्तानां श्रमार्तानां शोकार्तानां तपस्विनाम्।

विश्रान्तिजननं काले नाट्यमेतद्भविष्यति ॥ I, 115.

ब्रह्मर्षीणां च विज्ञेयं नाट्यं वृत्तान्तदर्शनम् । I, 121.

The first given passage is referred to by Abhinava also in connection with the discussion on the admissibility of S'ānta as a Rasa and by drawing attention to this bit—क्वचिच्छमः, Abhinava asks whether Bharata did not recognise the quietistic element also as part of dramatic presentation :

"प्रतीयत एवेति मुनिनाप्यङ्गीक्रियत एव 'क्वचिच्छमः' इत्यादि वदता ।" Abhinava, Locana, p. 177.

Another instance of Bharata's awareness of the element of S'ānta is pointed out by Abhinava. It is similar to the second passage extracted above. It refers to such spectators as are bereft of life's passions—Vītarāgas—to whom only dramas of a nature in harmony with theirs and dramas depicting the Mokṣa puruṣārtha can have any appeal. While pointing out in Ch. XXVII that the very life of drama is its fusion with the audience and that certain hearts can respond only to certain themes, Bharata says :

तुष्यन्ति तरुणाः कामे विदग्धाः समयाश्रिते ।

अर्थेष्वर्थपराश्चैव मोक्षेष्वथ विरागिणः ॥

XXVII, 59, Kās'ī Edn.

Says Abhinava in regard to this passage :

"हृदयसंवादोऽपि तथाविधतत्त्वज्ञानबीजसंस्कारभावितानां भवत्येव, यद्वक्ष्यति 'मोक्षे चापि विरागिणः' इति" । Gaek. Edn., I, p. 340.

Further, Bharata speaks of a Kāma for each Puruṣārtha in Ch. XXIV and mentions here the variety called Mokṣa Kāma. What does this mean ?

धर्मकामोऽर्थकामश्च मोक्षकामस्तथैव च ।

स्त्रीपुंसयोस्तु संयोगो यः, कामः स तु संस्मृतः ॥ XXIV, 91.

The S'ānta is only the Rasa of Mokṣa Kāma. Compare the Mahābhārata, Ās'va. parvan, Ch. XIII, 16, where Kāma says of himself :

यो मां प्रयतते हन्तुं मोक्षमास्थाय पण्डितः ।

तस्य मोक्षरतिस्थस्य नृत्यामि च हसामि च ॥

Again, what does Bharata mean by giving great scope for Dharma as an important theme handled in drama, by saying that drama is Dharmya, by mentioning Dharma as the purpose of some dramas, क्वचिद् धर्मः, by speaking of Dharma S'ṛṅgāra and by pointing out that the old, the learned and the experienced respond to such dramas as are based on Dharmākhyānapurāṇa which comes under the Vibhāvānubhāva of the S'ānta ?

धर्माख्यानपुराणेषु वृद्धास्तुष्यन्ति नित्यशः । XXVII, 61.

While describing Nirveda[1], Bharata speaks of one kind of it that is born of Tattvajñāna ; giving the causes of Glāni, he speaks of Taponiyama ; defining Dhṛti[2], Bharata gives Vijñāna, S'ruti, S'aucācāra and Gurubhakti as some of its Vibhāvas and these pertain to S'ānta ; Mati is given as born of Nānās'āstravicintana. If the quietistic element is not recognised even in some aspect by him, Bharata cannot say of Nāṭya that it is Trailokyānukaraṇa, that there is no Jñāna which in not

[1] Some hold this Nirveda as the Sthāyin of S'ānta.

[2] Bhoja holds this Dhṛti as the Sthāyin of S'ānta in his S. K. Ā. V. 23 and also pp. 514-5.

part of drama and no Vidyā which does not come within it :

न तत् ज्ञानम् etc. I, 117.

The instances above shown point only to the recognition of S'ama as an element and they do not mean Bharata's acceptance of the S'ānta as a Rasa. To be precise, S'ama is not mentioned as one of the forty-nine Bhāvas. Bharata did not have before him any specimen of drama written only for Mokṣa and Virāgins. It may be that there cannot also be dramas having *only* Bhayānaka, Adbhuta, etc., as their Rasa. These can appear only as Aṅga or Sañcāri rasas. But the reason for the acceptance of Bhayānaka, Adbhuta, Bībhatsa, etc., as Rasas is that humanity is more liable to these than to S'ama, hearts attuned to which must necessarily be very small in number. S'ama is almost impossible. For, the opponents of S'ānta say, Ignorance, Avidyā, producing Rāga and Dveṣa which result in a network of psychology covered by the eight Sthāyins, is inborn in man ever since he began his migration in Saṁsāra and practically speaking, this Avidyā cannot be rooted out. That is, S'ama which is their absence cannot be obtained. The Avaloka on the Das'arūpaka says :

"अन्ये तु वस्तुतस्तस्याभावं वर्णयन्ति । अनादिकालप्रवाहायात-रागद्वेषयोरुच्छेत्तुमशक्यत्वात् ।" p. 117.

This, however, is not wholly true for there is not any lack of persons who take to S'ama and strive to root out Rāga and Dveṣa. But this criticism against S'ānta is pertinent to some extent in regard to drama generally which is for pleasure and which deals with worldly things. Drama arose as an entertainment : क्रीडनीयकमिच्छामो दृश्यं श्रव्यं च यद् भवेत् । Bharata often says that Nāṭya is Vinodajanana. Bhāmaha also says that

though the Mahākāvya depicts all the four Puruṣārthas, it shall predominantly inculcate only Artha.

मन्त्रदूतप्रयाणाजिनायकाभ्युदयैश्च यत् ।

. . . .

चतुर्वर्गाभिधानेऽपि भूयसार्थोपदेशकृत् ॥ K. A., I, 20-21.

Abhinava draws our attention in this connection to Bharata's definition of Nāṭaka which emphasises the fact that it shall depict chiefly worldly prosperity, gaiety, etc. From this point of view, Abhinava even says that S'ānta is after all only Apradhāna, not the leading motif.

"अत एव शान्तस्य स्थायित्वेऽप्यप्राधान्यम् । जीमूतवाहने त्रिवर्गसम्पत्तेरेव परोपकृतिप्रधानायाः फलत्वात् । अनेनैवाशयेन नाटक-लक्षणे वक्ष्यते 'ऋद्धिविलासादिभिर्गुणैः (N. S'., XX, 11.)' इति । अनेन हि ऋद्धिविलासप्रधानमर्थकामोत्तरं सर्वं चरितं सकललोकहृदय-संवादसुन्दरप्रयोजनं नाटके निवेशयितव्यमित्युक्तम् । एतच्च तत्रैव वर्ण-यिष्यामः ।" Gaek. Edn., I, p. 339.

Therefore it is that the Candrikākāra, the earlier commentator on the Dhva. Ā., says that the S'ānta spoken of by Ānanda is certainly admissible as a Rasa, but that it can appear only as an Aṅga rasa in the Prāsaṅgika Itivṛtta and never as the chief Rasa figuring in the Ādhikārika Itivṛtta. Evidently, the Candrikākāra also held the view that Vīra and S'ṛṅgāra are the Rasas in the Nāgānanda in accordance with the ending in the attainment of Vidyādharacakravartitva and the sustained love-theme, and that the S'ānta came in as a subsidiary idea to give a new variety of Vīra called Dayāvīra. Abhinava, however, rejects this view of the Candrikā in his Locana.

"आधिकारिकत्वेन तु शान्तो रसो (रसो न) निबद्धव्य इति चन्द्रिकाकारः। तच्चेहास्माभिर्न पर्यालोचितम्।" Locana, p. 178.

But the above given extract from the Abhi. Bhā. seems to grant what Abhinava has criticised in his own Locana. He seems to grant that it is literature of Trivarga-interest that is of wide appeal in the world. Early dramas likewise dealt with Trivarga and the eight Rasas only.

But soon drama was to be made the noble vehicle of spiritual and religious instruction to the masses. Leaving the Brahminic Mahābhārata, we find As'vaghoṣa's Buddhacarita and Saundarananda starting the religious Kāvya, and his S'ārīputraprakaraṇa and the allegorical dramatic fragment discovered by Dr. Luders, the religious drama. The Buddhistic and Jain poets and dramatists might have been responsible for the introduction of philosophical poems[1] and plays, for

[1] (*a*) The Saundarananda has two verses in the end in which As'vaghoṣa says that he wrote a Mahākāvya for Upas'ānti and Mokṣa, mixing a Tikta-medicine with Madhu.

इत्येषा व्युपशान्तये न रतये मोक्षार्थगर्भा कृतिः
श्रोतॄणां ग्रहणार्थमन्यमनसां काव्योपचारात्कृता ।
यन्मोक्षात्कृतमन्यदत्र हि मया तत्काव्यधर्मात्कृतं
पातुं तिक्तमिवौषधं मधुयुतं हृद्यं कथं स्यादिति ॥

. . . . .

काव्यव्याजेन तत्त्वं कथितमिह मया मोक्षपरमिति ।

(*b*) The Jain work, the Vastuvijñānaratnakos'a, is a handbook of knowledge of miscellaneous things enumerated in sets of one, two, etc. (Peterson's Report III, Oxford, 352*a*. IO, Keith 7583-4, Asiatic Soc. Beng. 4703 A). Of uncertain date, this work mentions Turuṣkas in the 36 Rājavaṁs'as given by it. Albeit its Jain authorship, it gives only *Eight* Rasas,—अष्टौ रसाः (Peterson III, p. 268*a*).

(*c*) There is a Jain work named Adhyātmakalpadruma by Munisundarasūri (end of the 14th and early part of the 15th cent.

making S'ānta the Aṅgi rasa of the Ādhikārika itivṛtta. We know that there were Buddhistic writers on Nāṭya like Rāhula, who, as citations of his views in the Abhinavabhāratī show, had his own differences from Bharata. Further, the Jain Anuyogadvāra sūtra, placed in the fifth century, mentions nine Rasas, adding the Pras'āntarasa to the eight old Rasas (see below). Dr. S. K. De says in his Skr. Poetics (Vol. I, p. 36 f.n.): "The Jaina Anuyogadāra Sutta (ed. N. S. P. 1915, fol. 134-5, also quoted in Weber ii, 2, pp. 701-2) which, Winternitz thinks, was probably put together by the middle of the fifth century, mentions nine Rasas, *which, however, have hardly any reference* (?) *to poetic or dramatic Rasas*; but the enumeration is interesting from the inclusion of Pras'ānta (not mentioned by Bharata) apparently from religious motives." It is not known why Dr. De considers these nine Rasas mentioned in the Anuyogadvāra sūtra as having hardly any reference to poetic or dramatic Rasas. They are definitely mentioned in the work as 'णव कव्व रसा', the nine Rasas of Kāvya (see below).

The Nāgānanda, the first and only specimen to which the early advocates of S'ānta cling, is a Buddhistic story. S'rīharṣa had leanings towards Buddhism and if this king S'rīharṣa is the same as the Vārtikakāra of the Nāṭyas'āstra quoted in the Abhinavabhāratī (which, however, is yet quite unproven), it is likely that his Nāṭya Vārttika, which must have made

A. D.), which is otherwise called *S'āntarasabhāvanā*. (Ed. Nirnayasāgar, 1906, with extracts from Dharmavijayagaṇi's gloss). The work says in the Pratijñās'loka that S'ānta is proposed to be treated in the work and in the next verse which is titled, '*S'āntarasamāhātmya*', the author describes the S'ānta as *Rasendra*. The commentary describes the S'ānta as "*S'rīmān S'āntanāmā Rasādhirājaḥ*" and "*S'arvarasasāra*". Compare also the names of some other Jain works S'āntasudhārasakāvya of Vinayavijayagaṇi and the Pras'amarati of Umāsvāti (see esp. S'l. 106 in the latter).

उक्त-अनुक्त-दुरुक्तचिन्तन, introduced the S'ānta as a Rasa. It seems very likely that it is the appearance of the Nāgānanda in the world of drama that created a stir and set the discussion on S'ānta on its feet in works on Nāṭya and Alaṁkāra.

What are the objections raised by the critics of S'ānta against recognising it as a Rasa? The first objection is that Bharata did not speak of it. This is really no serious objection. The greater objection is that pertaining to the real nature of S'ama itself. S'ama, its critics say, is the total absence of all feelings and activities. Such a state of non-action cannot be presented on the stage.

"कामाद्यभावोऽपि नानुभावः . . . प्रयोगासमवायित्वाच्च । न हि चेष्टाव्युपरमः प्रयोगयोग्यः ।" Abhi. Bhā., p. 334.

This argument proceeds on a wrong assumption. The state of absolute cessation of action is only the climax, the Paryanta-bhūmi, and this certainly cannot be shown. But the Paryanta-bhūmis of all other Rasas also sail in the same boat. S'ṛṅgāra is not denied as a Rasa because Samprayoga is unfit to be shown on the stage. So also murder and Raudra. So, the acceptance of S'ānta does not mean the attempt to present the impossible cessation of action but means only the portrayal of an ardent spirit in search of Truth and tranquillity. The manifold efforts of the Yatamāna, his trials, his victories over passions—these can be portrayed with great interest. Even one who has attained Truth can be shown and there will be no lack of action in him. A Siddha like Janaka will be doing Lokasaṅgraha. The Gītā says:

कुर्याद्विद्वांस्तथासक्तः चिकीर्षुर्लोकसङ्ग्रहम् । III, 25.

The Gītā speaks of many a thing which a Sthitaprajña does.

Similar to the above noticed objection is the explanation which another writer offers for the omission of the S'ānta. The Saundaryalaharī, ascribed to S'ankara, has three occasions to speak of the Rasas. In two verses 41 and 50, the hymn expressly mentions 'the nine Rasas', "nava rasa", in verse 41 with reference to Nāṭya and in verse 50 with reference to Kāvya. But in verse 51, the hymn refers only to eight Rasas which are described there as being expressed by the look of the Goddess. In the commentary on this verse, the 51st, Lolla Lakṣmīdhara offers an explanation for the omission of the S'ānta here. He says that according to Bharata's school, Rasas are only eight, for Rasa means a certain modification or state of the Citta and S'ānta being really the absence of any state or modification, some do not consider it a Rasa.

"विक्रियाजनका एव रसा इति अष्टौ रसा भरतमते । 'शान्तस्य निर्विकारत्वात् न शान्तं मेनिरे रसम्' इति शान्तस्य रसत्वाभावात् अष्टावेव रसाः सङ्गृहीताः ।" Pp. 154-5, Mysore Edn.

It is clear from Lakṣmīdhara's remarks here and on the two verses mentioning the nine Rasas that personally he would accept the S'ānta. But any definite and detailed idea of Lakṣmīdhara's views on the S'ānta could be had only when we recover his Sāhitya work, the Lakṣmīdhara, mentioned by him among his works in the colophon at the end of his commentary on the Saundaryalaharī.

That Bharata has not given the Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicārins of S'ānta, as also its appropriate Vṛtti, musical Jāti, etc. is another trifling objection. These can be easily made out. Abhinava gives them. The interpolated S'ānta text in Bharata gives the Vibhāvas, etc. of S'ānta. The Sthāyin of S'ānta is elaborately discussed in a special section

below. Its Vibhāvas are given in the text as Tattvajñāna, Vairāgya, Ās'ayas'uddhi, etc. Its Anubhāvas are Yama, Niyama, the practice of virtues, penance etc. Almost all Bhāvas can be its Vyabhicārins. Abhinava adds the Vibhāvas, साधुसमागम, सत्संपर्क, the good done in the past births, God's grace, study of philosophy, etc. Abhinava further remarks that in S'ānta one can see and enjoy the Anubhāvas, *viz.*, the slow disappearance of Kāma, Krodha and other evils and that though the whole world of Bhāvas becomes Vyabhicārin for the S'ānta, such Bhāvas like Nirveda and Jugupsā for worldly objects, Dhṛti, Mati, Utsāha of the type in Dayāvīra, Rati for God in the form of Bhakti and S'raddhā will stand out prominently as more intimate accessories, Ābhyantara Aṅgas.[1] The text of the Abhinavabhāratī bearing on these is edited in a further section of this paper.

The next objection against S'ānta is the impossibility of S'ānta becoming a general feature of humanity in the same measure and to the same extent as Rati, etc., for the whole world is wrapped in Avidyā and is eternally slave to Rāga and Dveṣa. We know of the eight Sthāyins only, as instinctive in man. Dhṛti, Mati, etc. are given as Vyabhicārins in S'ānta but we do not know of Dhṛti or Mati helping S'ama. All the Dhṛti and Mati known to us is mingled with Rāga and Dveṣa and other mundane associations.

धृतिप्रभृतिरपि प्राप्तविषयोपरागः कथं शान्ते स्यात् ।

Abhi. Bhā., p. 334.

[1] In ch. 6 (pp. 135-6) S'āradātanaya again treats of S'ānta, in a clumsy manner. First he praises it as the Rasa which gives Mokṣa and gives its Vibhāvas, etc. Then he says that it has not got Vibhāvas, etc. to a full extent, is Vikalāṅga ; but concludes that despite its imperfections, it is Prakṛṣṭa because of its relation with the fourth Puruṣārtha of Mokṣa.

Nor is the portrayal of non-action any good for Vyutpatti. The mere presentation of non-action does not educate anybody in the means to attain knowledge of Truth.

न च अकिञ्चित्करत्वमात्रेण तत्त्वज्ञानोपाये व्युत्पाद्यन्ते विनेयाः ।

Ibid., p. 334.

The quietistic element is not a dominant factor in man's life. If a poet develops it, it will become strange and unbelievable that there are really such impossible men who have spurned the pleasures of the world, women, position, wealth, etc. The general mass of the audience is mostly of ordinary men who will hardly respond to such a drama or have any Cittasaṁvāda in it. The Avaloka on the Das'arūpaka says :

'अन्ये तु वस्तुतस्तस्य अभावं वर्णयन्ति । अनादिकालप्रवाहायातरागद्वेषयोरुच्छेत्तुमशक्यत्वात्' । D. R. A., p. 117.

'न च तथाभूतस्य शान्तरसस्य सहृदयाः स्वादयितारः सन्ति ।'

Ibid., p. 124.

All these objections are raised and answered by Ānandavardhana :

'यदि नाम सर्वजनानुभवगोचरता तस्य नास्ति, नैतावतासौ अलोकसामान्यमहानुभावचित्तवृत्तिवत् प्रतिक्षेप्तुं शक्यः ।' Dhva. Ā., p. 177.

That the major part of humanity is wallowing in mundane pleasures does not disprove the existence of saints and sages. There are persons of spiritualistic bent and to them the S'ānta play is bound to appeal. To them, the S'ṛṅgāra and Vīra plays will have little appeal. Surely, on that ground, S'ṛṅgāra and Vīra are not dismissed from the fold of Rasas.

"ननु तत्र हृदयसंवादाभावाद्रस्यमानतैव नोपपन्ना। क एवमाह नास्तीति? यतः प्रतीयत एवेत्युक्तम्। ननु प्रतीयते, सर्वस्य श्लाघास्पदं न भवति। तर्हि वीतरागाणां शृङ्गारो न श्लाघ्य इति सोऽपि रसाच्च्यवतामिति तदाह—यदि नामेति।" Locana, p. 177.

The argument of the impossibility of non-action being shown has already been refuted.

An extension of the argument that the S'ānta is not relishable is the argument that drama which is essentially for entertainment and Trivargavyutpatti must depict Ṛddhi, Vilāsa, etc. So have all dramas done. There are no plays which have developed S'ānta. The Nāgānanda, which some hold as a S'ānta play, is plainly not so. For the end here is not Mokṣa, but the attaining of lordship over the Vidyādharas; and all through, the love-theme runs and this is the first thing antagonistic to S'ānta. Therefore Vīra and S'ṛṅgāra, the former as Dayāvīra, stand out prominently in the Nāgānanda.

"यत्तु कैश्चिन्नागानन्दादौ शमस्य स्थायित्वमुपवर्णितम्, तत्तु मलयवत्यनुरागेण आप्रबन्धप्रवृत्तेन विद्याधरचक्रवर्तित्वप्राप्त्या विरुद्धम्। न ह्येकानुकार्यविभावालम्बनौ विषयानुरागापरागावुपलब्धौ। अतो दयावीरोत्साहस्यात्र स्थायित्वम्। तत्रैव शृङ्गारस्य अङ्गत्वेन चक्रवर्तित्वादेश्च फलत्वेन अविरोधात् ईप्सितमेव च सर्वत्र कर्तव्यमिति परोपकारप्रवृत्तस्य विजिगीषोः नान्तरीयकत्वेन फलं संपद्यत इति आवेदितमेव प्राक्।"

D. R. Avaloka, p. 117.

All the arguments given above cannot disprove the possibility of S'ānta as a Rasa capable of relish by spectators. It is bound to be uncommon; all the same, it is as true as the inner experience and the higher life of the mystic which is

not in common with the life of ordinary worldly men. If S'ama is not only a part of the world but a glorious part of it also, it should also be so of the drama. Abhinava says that literature, poetry and drama, cannot restrict themselves to the Trivarga only but must get ennobled by embracing the fourth and the greatest Puruṣārtha also, Mokṣa. The attitude to Mokṣa is S'ama and S'ānta is the Rasa of the drama which depicts the endeavour to attain that.

"अत्रोच्यते—यथा इह तावत् धर्मादित्रितयम्, एवं मोक्षोऽपि पुरुषार्थः, शास्त्रेषु स्मृतीतिहासादिषु च प्राधान्येन उपायतो व्युत्पाद्यत इति सुप्रसिद्धम्। यथा च कामादिषु समुचिताश्चित्तवृत्तयो रत्यादिशब्दवाच्याः कविनटव्यापारेण आस्वादयोग्यताप्रापणद्वारेण तथाविधहृदयसंवादवतः सामाजिकान् प्रति रसत्वं शृङ्गारादितया नीयन्ते, तथा मोक्षाभिधानपरमपुरुषार्थोचिता चित्तवृत्तिः किमिति रसत्वं नानीयत इति वक्तव्यम्।" Abhi. Bhā., I, Gaek. Edn., p. 334.

To say that it is impossible to exterminate Rāga and Dveṣa is to insult humanity, its heritage of philosophy and the long chain of its spiritual leaders. Surely there are men of that mind which can respond to a S'ānta drama. That hedonists are not able to sit through it cannot disprove S'ānta. It will be a pity if literature, and drama in particular, cannot rise beyond the level of mere entertainment and gaiety. It has been accepted that all cannot respond to all Rasas. Surely Bhayānaka will not raise sympathy in a heroic spirit. Bharata himself gives the respective characters—Prakṛtis—who respond to the different Rasas. Bhaya and Jugupsā are Nīca-prakṛti Bhāvas; Uttama Sāmājikas do not have Cittasaṁvāda on seeing them. If Viṭas delight in S'ṛṅgāra, Vītarāgas delight in S'ānta.

" हृदयसंवादोऽपि तथाविधतत्त्वज्ञानबीजसंस्कारभावितानां भवत्येव, यद्वक्ष्यति 'मोक्षे चापि विरागिणः' इति । सर्वस्य नैकत्र (or न सर्वत्र) हृदयसंवादः, भयानके वीरप्रकृतेरभावात् ।" Abhi. Bhā., I, p. 340, [Gaek. Edn.

And Bharata also says :

'न चैते गुणाः सर्वे एकस्मिन् प्रेक्षके स्मृताः ।

. . . .

उत्तमाधममध्यानां संकीर्णानां तु संसदि ।
न शक्यमधमैर्ज्ञातुमुत्तमानां विचेष्टितम् ॥

. . . .

तुष्यन्ति तरुणाः कामे विदग्धाः समयाश्रिते ।
अर्थेष्वर्थपराश्चैव मोक्षेष्वथ विरागिणः ॥
नानाशीलाः प्रकृतयः शीले नाट्यं प्रतिष्ठितम् ।

. . . .

शूरा बीभत्सरौद्रेषु नियुद्धेष्वाहवेषु च ।
एवं भावानुकरणैर्यो यस्मिन् प्रविशेन्नरः ।
प्रेक्षकः स तु मन्तव्यो गुणैरेतैरलङ्कृतः ॥'

N. S'. XXVII, 56-62.

There is a continuous chain of literature that depicts the supreme Rasa of S'ānta. In Kāvya, Ānanda argues in Ud. IV, that the Mahābhārata leads as the great epic of S'ānta. All the vicissitudes of the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas are only the Vācyavācaka, the Pūrvapakṣa, of which the purpose is the suggestion of the fact that S'ama is the greatest for which man should strive.[1] The utter uselessness of even the great victory

[1] *Vide* The Message of the Mahābhārata, V. Rāghavan, The Māhābhārata, G. A. Natesan & Sons, Madras.

at Kurukṣetra, not to mention other worldly victories, is very well brought out by the epic. By the annihilation of even the race of Kṛṣṇa and by postulating Kṛṣṇa as the central personality, as the pivot of the plot, by calling the epic Nārāyaṇakathā, sage Vyāsa has made his message plain. The genius of Vyāsa would not have attempted at anything lower than this.[1]

[1] The following ideas and passages in the epic may be considered in this connection :

(*a*) In the first Adhyāya of the Anukramaṇikāparvan, the epic salutes Dharma and Kṛṣṇa, its promulgator and sustainer, and says that it shall speak of the eternal Dharmas. If a work is a Dharms'āstra in Vācyavācaka, it is a Mokṣa S'āstra in Dhvani.

नमो धर्माय महते नमः कृष्णाय वेधसे ।
ब्राह्मणेभ्यो नमस्कृत्य धर्मान् वक्ष्यामि शाश्वतान् ॥ S'l. 3.

(*b*) In S'l. 32 of the same ch. Sauti says that the Bhārata is the story of the Lord Himself : यस्य प्रसादाद्वक्ष्यामि **नारायणकथामिमाम्** ।

(*c*) While giving the essential ideas of the great epic, it is said that the epic depicts the greatness of the Lord : वासुदेवस्य माहात्म्यम् , . . . उक्तवान् भगवानृषिः ।

(*d*) युधिष्ठिरो धर्ममयो महाद्रुमः
मूलं कृष्णो ब्रह्म च ब्राह्मणाश्च ॥

(*e*) In S'ls. 104-8 in which the epic is described as a tree, it is said in S'l. 106 that the great fruit of this tree is the S'āntiparvan : 'शान्तिपर्वमहाफलः'.

(*f*) At the end of the Anukramaṇikāparvan, Dhṛtarāṣtra who is grieved at the loss of his sons is consoled by Sañjaya who has a hymn on Kāla, the all-devouring Kāla, on hearing which the old king got Dhṛti.

धृतराष्ट्रोऽपि तच्छ्रुत्वा **धृतिमेव** समाश्रयत् ।
दिष्ट्येदमागतमिति मत्वा स **प्राज्ञसत्तमः** ॥ 278.

Immediately after this, the Bhārata is described as Upaniṣad :

अत्रोपनिषदं पुण्यां कृष्णद्वैपायनोऽब्रवीत् ॥ 279.

(*g*) In S'l, 291, the Bhārata is likened to the Āraṇyakas among the Vedas.

(*h*) In S'ls. 35-36, in the Parvasaṅgrahaparvan it is said that the wise seek the Bhārata, even as Vairāgya is sought by those

If one finds relish and importance in the subsidiary themes of marriage, dice, suffering, fight, it does not prevent another reader of nobler instincts and mystic disposition seeing through

who desire liberation; and that it is like Ātman among things one must realise:

विचित्रार्थपदाख्यानमनेकसमयान्वितम् ।
प्रतिपन्नं नरैः प्राज्ञैर्वैराग्यमिव मोक्षिभिः ॥
आत्मेव वेदितव्येषु . . श्रेष्ठः सर्वागमेष्वयम् ॥ 35, 36.

(*i*) At the end of the Parvasaṅgrahaparvan and at the end of the Mahāprasthānika, Dharma is sung of as the supreme good, not either Artha or Kāma. (I, ii, 392, and XVIII, v, 76-7.)

(*j*) Ch. 62, Ādi.

अस्मिन्नर्थश्च कामश्च निखिलेनोपदेक्ष्यते ।
इतिहासे महापुण्ये बुद्धिश्च परिनैष्ठिकी ॥ 19.
धर्मशास्त्रमिदं पुण्यमर्थशास्त्रमिदं परम् ।
मोक्षशास्त्रमिदं प्रोक्तं व्यासेनामितबुद्धिना ॥ 25.
धर्मे चार्थे च कामे च मोक्षे च भरतर्षभ ।
यदिहास्ति तदन्यत्र यन्नेहास्ति न कुत्रचित् ॥ 26.

(*k*) Both in the beginning and end, all-devouring Kāla is sung of. (I, i, 272-275 and XVI, ix, 36-40.) This is for Vairāgya.

(*l*) The triumph of Time, the vanity of earthly glories and the inevitable Nirveda are given in a masterly manner when the great archer, Arjuna, tried and tried, but could not use his bow when before his very eyes the Yādava women were lifted by the Dasyus and Ābhiras:

ददर्शापदि कष्टायां गाण्डीवस्य पराभवम् ।
सर्वेषां चैव दिव्यानामस्त्राणामप्रसन्नताम् ॥
नाशं वृष्णिकलत्राणां प्रभावाणामनित्यताम् ।
दृष्ट्वा निर्वेदमापन्नो व्यासवाक्यप्रचोदितः ॥
धर्मराजं समासाद्य सन्न्यासं समरोचयत् ॥ 361-3.

In the second of his introductory verses in his commentary on the Gītā, Abhinavagupta says that the chief fruit of the epic of

these, and deducing the greatness of the Lord, of Dharma, S'āma and Mokṣa. To write in such a perfect manner as to give Vis'rānti for the readers in the Sañcāri-rasas and Sañcāri-themes also is not only not incompatible but is in perfect harmony with the chief Rasa and chief idea. *Vide* Dhva. Ā. Ud.. IV, p. 238. Also Abhinava in his Abhi. Bhā.:

'दृष्टः अङ्गेष्वपि विश्रान्तिलाभः, स्वभावौचित्यात्, यथा रामस्य वीराङ्गे पितुराज्ञां पालयतः ।' Gaek. I, p. 339.[1]

Next in importance to the Mahābhārata are the two S'ānta rasa poems of As'vaghoṣa, the Buddhacarita and the

Vyāsa is Mokṣa, and that Dharma, etc., are for its development.

द्वैपायनेन मुनिना यदिदं व्यधायि
शास्त्रं सहस्रशतसंमितमत्र मोक्षः ।
प्राधान्यतः फलतया प्रथितस्तदन्य-
धर्मादि तस्य परिपोषयितुं प्रणीतम् ॥

Abhinava's pupil, Kṣemendra, holds S'ānta as the teaching of the M. Bhārata. He says at the end of his Bhāratamañjarī:

रत्नोदारचतुस्समुद्ररशनां भुक्त्वा भुवं कौरवो
भग्नोरुः पतितस्स निष्परिजनो जीवन्वृकैर्भक्षितः ।
गोपैर्विश्वजयी जितस्स विजयः कृष्णः क्षिता वृष्णयः
तस्मात्सर्वमिदं विचार्य सुचिरं शान्त्यै मनो दीयताम् ॥

[1] The author of the Bhāgavata, in his criticism of the Bhārata, says that in the Great Epic, Vyāsa had described 'Pravṛtti' (as Pūrvapakṣa) so much and so well, that man who is by nature attached to it, has mistaken to Pūrvapaksa itself for the Siddhānta.

जुगुप्सितं धर्मकृतेऽनुशासतः
स्वभावरक्तस्य महान् व्यतिक्रमः ।
यद्वाक्यतो धर्म इतीतरः स्थितो
न मन्यते तस्य निवारणं जनः ॥ I, 5, 15.

Sāundarananda. The following is a list of other S'ānta rasa kāvyas:

1. The Rājataraṅgiṇī of Kalhaṇa mentions S'ānta as its Rasa. I, 23. No great history can escape the ultimate suggestion of the noble Rasa of S'ānta but Dr. Keith considers, in his Skt. Literature, that the S'ānta in Kalhaṇa is a moral bias detracting from his merit as a historian.

2. Kaivalyavallī pariṇaya vilāsa, a philosophical Kāvya written perhaps by a Travancore prince or poet attached to him. Bhakti, Kaṭākṣalakṣmī (the saving grace of the Lord), Brahmavidyā and Kaivalyavallī are some of the characters figuring in this poem.

IO. Keith. 8133.

3. Jñānamudrāpariṇaya Kāvya.

Oppert 5537. (Auf. I, 210a.)

4. Haṁsasandes'a, anon, (different from Vedāntades'ika's H. S. and Rūpa's H. dūta). Vedānta. With a commentary in verses. JRAS. 1884, pp. 450-1. Edn. TSS. No. 103.

5. Indudūta by Vinayavijayagaṇi. Kāvyamālā, Gucch. 14. A pupil sends the moon to convey to his preceptor his own spiritual progress.

6. Cetodūta. No. 25. Ātmānanda granthamālā Series, Bhavanagar. Theme identical with that of the previous works.

7. Bhaktidūtī by Kālīprasāda (23 verses): a message to the beloved called Mukti, through the maid Bhakti. Rajendralal Mitra, Notices, III, p. 27.

8. Manodūta by Viṣṇudāsa: Bhakti. IO. Vol. VII. Nos. 3897-9. Mitra, Notices, II, 613. Alwar, 944.

9. Manodūta by Rāmarāma: Bhakti (Vaṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣad MS.).

10. Manodūtikā on Jīva-Ātman relations. Stein, pp. 70, 287. Intro. p. xxxv. Cabaton, Bibliotheque Nationale Catalogue, I, 449c. [Same as Auf. I, p. 429a—Manodūtikā, Vedānta, Paris D. 253, III.]

11. Manodūta, Jain. Jain Granthāvali, p. 332.

12. Meghadūtasamasyālekhā by Meghavijaya. This is a message to the author's Guru, like No. 5.

13. S'īladūta by Cāritrasundaragaṇi; not a regular Dūtakāvya.

14. Manodūta by Indires'a: according to Puṣṭimārga. Br. Mu. Pt. Bks. Cat. 1906-28, 338.

15. Siddhadūta of Avadhūtarāma. (Saṁvat, 1423) (Bom. Br. R.A.S. 1235). Here, "a Tāpasa is the lover, a Siddha is the Dūta and Vidyā is the beloved."

16. Tanjore New Cat. 3792. Jñānavilāsakāvya by Jagannātha. "This is an allegorical Kāvya explaining the greatness of Vedānta."

17. Tanjore New Cat. 3736. Vijñānataraṅgiṇī by Mahārudrasimha. A Kāvya on the life of S'aṅkaradāsa, a great devotee.

18. Mysore I, p. 246. Gītavītarāga (2 MSS.) by Abhinava Cārukīrtipaṇḍitācārya. This work is called Bāhubalisvāmi Aṣṭapadī in a MS. in the Jain Mutt at S'ravana Belagola. This appears to be a Jain S'ānta Rasa imitation of the Gītagovinda of Jayadeva.

Among dramas, As'vaghoṣa's seem to be the earliest to have S'ānta as their dominant Rasa. His S'ārīputraprakaraṇa deals with the conversion of the hero to the Buddhistic faith and another of his dramatic fragments discovered by Dr. Leuders shows an allegorical spiritual drama. Long after the time of Ānanda, and about the time of Abhinava, Kṛṣṇamis'ra (c. 1098) wrote his Advaita allegory, the

Prabodhacandrodaya,[1] which inaugurated a regular category of philosophical and allegorical plays. The following plays of this class were produced in different parts of the country, to propagate the several schools of philosophical and religious thought :

1. Moharājaparājaya, Jain. Yas'aḥpāla. (c. A.D. 1229-32). Gaek. IX.

2. Amṛtodaya. Nyāya. Gokulanātha. A.D. 16th cent. Kāvyamālā.

3. Saṅkalpasūryodaya. Vis'iṣṭādvaita. Veṅkaṭanātha 14th cent.

4. Caitanyacandrodaya. Caitanya. Kavikarṇapūra. Kāvyamālā. (c. A.D. 1550).

5. Vidyāpariṇayana. Advaita. Ānandarāya. (c. A.D. 1684-1728. Kāvyamālā [2].

6. Dharmavijaya. S'uklabhūdeva. Ed. Bombay. MSS. in many catalogues. For com. on this, see Peterson, IV, p. 27.

7. Bhāvanāpuruṣottama. Advaita. Ratnakheṭa S'rīnivāsadīkṣita, father of Rājacūḍāmaṇi dīkṣita.

Tanjore New Cat. Nos. 4427-4429.

8. Muktipariṇaya. Sundaradeva.

Tanjore New Cat. 4460. NW. Provinces Cat. Pt. VII, p. 46.

[1] There seems to be an abridged version of the Prabodhacandrodaya of Kṛṣṇamis'ra,—Laghu Prabodhacandrodaya Nāṭaka, Vishrambhag collection No. 239, p. 428, S. R. Bhandarkar's Deccan College Catalogue. There seems to be a Prabodhacandrodaya Kāvya also in four Ullāsas. A MS. of this work is noticed in the Private Diary of Mr. R. A. Sastri, now deposited in the Catalogus Catalogorum Office, Madras University, on p. 34 of Part I, as existing in the Pyāra Candra Jain Big Mandir, Sailana State (Malwa, C.I.).

[2] This author wrote an Āyurveda allegory called Jīvānandana, (Kāvyamālā) in which Religion also figures.

9. Pracaṇḍarāhūdaya. Ghanas'yāma.[1]

Tanjore New Cat. 4388.

10. Jīvanmuktikalyāṇa. Nallādīkṣita. Advaita. Mysore I, pp. 276, 637. Adyar II, p. 27b. IO Keith, pp. 1224-5.

11. Cittavṛttikalyāṇa. Nallādīkṣita.[2] Mentioned by him in his Jīvanmuktikalyāṇa. IO Keith. p. 1225a. Rice p. 256. Aufrecht I, 207b and Rice 256 Mallāsomayājin is the same author.

12. Siddhāntabherīnāṭaka. Vis'iṣṭādvaita (?). Sudars'anācārya. Mysore I, p. 286.

13. Anumitipariṇaya : marriage between Anumiti, daughter of Parāmars'a with Nyāyarasika ; by Nṛsiṁhakavi of Triplicane, Madras. This play is of little philosophical interest ; it is a logic-play, तर्कनाटक.

MDSC.[3] 12463.

14. Vivekavijaya, the triumph of Viveka over passions by Rāmānuja Kavi, son of Pūrṇaguru and grandson of Rāmānuja guru, of S'rīperumbudur near Madras.

MDSC. 12683-4. Adyar II, p. 30b.

15. Bhaktivaibhavanāṭaka, on Kṛṣṇabhakti ; by Rājaguru Vāhinīpati Mm. Jīvadeva, son of Trilocanācārya, of Puri, patronised by King Pratāparudradeva.

MTSC. 3752.

[1] A strange dramatic composition of his is the Navagrahacarita. Tanjore New Cat. 4689.

Tanjore New cat. Vol. XIX, p. 55. Kalitāṇḍavanāṭaka may be a philosophical or religious drama.

[2] Dr. Keith's remark on p. 1225a of his IO catalogue and on p. 1695b, Index, that Mallādīkṣita is the correct name and 'Nallā-' is incorrect, is wrong. The name of this wellknown South Indian author is Nallādīkṣita.

[3] MDSC=Descriptive Cats. of the Madras Govt. Ori. MSS. Library.

MTSC=Triennial Cats. of the Madras Govt. Ori. MSS. Library.

16. Mithyājñānakhaṇḍana, a short allegorical play in one act; by Ravidāsa. IO. 4200. Bombay Branch R. A. S. 1289-90 and many other catalogues also.

17. Mudritakumudacandra, a dramatisation of a philosophical debate; by Yas'as'candra.

Bombay Branch R. A. S. 1292.

18. Pūrṇapuruṣārthacandrodaya, on the union of Ānandapakvavallī and King Das'āśva (lord of the ten senses, *i.e.*, Ātman); by Jātavedas of Vis'vāmitra gotra. The author later became an ascetic. MDSC. 12540-1. MDSC. 14602 is a metrical resumé of the story of this play.

There are 2 copies of a commentary on this drama in the Travancore list of MSS. collected in 1103 Kollam.

19. Jñānamudrāṇāṭaka.

Adyar II, p. 28a.

20. Prabodhodayanāṭaka by S'ukles'varanātha. The several systems of philosophy dispute here in a debate in the court of King Bhagavantarāya.

Mm. Haraprasad Sastry, Notices, II Series, Vol. III, No. 190, pp. 122-4.

21. S'ivanārāyaṇabhañja mahodayanāṭikā; an allegorical play from Orissa; by Narasiṁha mis'ra who lived under the patronage of S'iva Nārāyaṇa Bhañja, Rāja of Keonjhar. The work ends with Jīvanmukti.

Mm. Haraprasad Sastri, Report on search for Skr. MSS. 1805-1900. Calcutta, published by the Asiatic Soc., Bengal. 1901, p. 18.

22. Jñānasūryodayanāṭaka by Vādicandra; Jain; Hiralal, Centr. Prov. Cat. p. 646. No. 7252. Granthanāmāvali, Ailak Pannalal Digambar Jain Sarasvatī Bhavan, Jhalrapatan, p. 30. Peterson II, 198. III, 401. See Pāthak, J. of the Bom. Br. R.A.S. XVIII, p. 223 [1].

23. Mitra, Notices, 1607: Tārābhaktitaraṅgiṇī contains two allegorical dramatic sequences in which Kali, Dharma, Viveka, etc. figure as characters. The work as a whole however is not a drama.

24. Satsaṅgavijayanāṭaka by Vaijanātha.

Cat. of Skt. MSS. in the Private Libs. of Guj., Kath., Kacch, Sind and Khāṇdes' by Buhler. (II), p. 124. No. 54.

25. Svānubhūtināṭaka. MS. dated Sam. 1705; by Anantapaṇḍita, son of Tryambaka Paṇḍita.

S. R. Bhandarkar II Tour Report of MSS. in Raj. and Centr. India, 1904-6, p. 9.

26. Vivekacandrodayanāṭikā by S'iva.

S. R. Bhandarkar, Deccan Coll. Cat. p. 43. No. 31.

27. Dharmodayanāṭaka composed in 1692 S'aka, A.D. 1770, by Dharmadeva Gosvāmi who composed a Dharmodaya Kāvya also.

Jour. of the Assam Res. Society, III, 4, p. 119.

28. Māyāvijaya by Anantanārāyaṇasūri.

29. Jñānacandrodaya by Padmasundara.

The last two are mentioned on page v. fn. of the English introduction to the Gaekwad edition of the Moharājaparājaya (No. IX).

30. Ṣaṇmatanāṭaka by Jayantabhaṭṭa. Peterson's Report, V, p. 262. No. 407.

31. Tattvamudrābhadrodaya, by Triveṇī, a prolific south India Vaiṣṇava Brahmin poetess, daughter of Udayendrapuram Veṅkaṭācārya, author of a Yādavarāghavapāṇḍavīya.

[1] Akalaṅka's Aṣṭas'atī, commentary on Samantabhadra's Āptamīmāṁsā, is introduced as a female character in this drama.

She lived between 1817-83 and was the wife of Prativādi-bhayaṅkaram Veṅkaṭācārya of S'rīperumbudur.

(Dr. M. Kṛṣṇamacharya, M.A., M.L., PH.D. Skr. Poetesses, pp. 62-63, Souvenir of the Silver Jubilee of the Trivandrum Skr. Series).

32. Antarvyākaraṇanāṭyapariśiṣṭa: a dramatic composition by Kṛṣṇānanda Sarasvatī, published in 4 parts from Calcutta 1894 (?)—1899. This achieves a Vyākaraṇa-Dharma S'leṣa, *i.e.* inculcates at once rules of grammar and moral and philosophical teachings.

British Museum, Printed Books Catalogue, 1892-1906, Column 320.

33. The Bhartṛharirājyatyāganāṭaka by Kṛṣṇabaladeva varmā. Published, Lucknow, 1898. *Ibid.* 315.

34. Citsūryāloka by Nṛsiṁha daivajña; allegorical drama in 5 acts. Vizianagaram, 1894. *Ibid.* 437.

35. Īhāmṛgī or Sarvavinoda in 4 acts; dealing with S'ṛṅgāra, Bībhatsa, Hāsya and *Vairāgya.* By Kṛṣṇa avadhūta, a Ghaṭikās'atamahākavi. Bellary, 1895. *Ibid.* 315.

36. Pāṣaṇḍadharmakhaṇḍana by Dāmodarās'rama, in 3 acts showing up the heresy and immorality of the Puṣṭi-mārgins. Composed in Samvat 1683.

Br. Mu. Prt. Bks. Cat. 1906-28, Col. 234.

37. Svātmaprakās'anāṭaka by Sundaras'āstrin of Polaham village (Tanjore Dt.) Advaita. Pub. Chidambaram, 1319. *Ibid.* 1037-8.

38. Kṛṣṇbhakticandrikānāṭaka by Anantadeva, son of Āpadeva. Numerous MSS. Edn. Bombay Grantharatnamālā, 1887-92.[1]

[1] [MDSC. 12548 and 12754: Prapanna sapiṇḍikaraṇanirāsa is a drama strange in its theme which is a controversy regarding the proper obsequial rites to be performed for a dead Prapanna.

Besides there are many late dramas on the lives of the religious leaders, saints and devotees of S'iva and Viṣṇu. Rāmānujācārya's career is dramatised in the Yatirājavijaya or Vedāntavilāsa by Varadācārya of Kāñcī. (MDSC. 12696-12700; Tanjore Cat. 4486; Mysore I, p. 281; Adyar II, p. 30a). S'ivabhaktānandanāṭaka, MTSC. 5092 and 5520, is on the life of one of the S'aivite saints. Such dramas are more truly spiritual; for their portrayal of the religious and spiritual career of such personalities is more effective than the presentation of abstract spiritual ideas as characters on the stage. A love-story evokes love and for this purpose, one does not write a play in which S'ṛṅgāra figures as a character with Madhu, Viraha, etc. as other characters. Thus dramas on the life of saints and devotees are S'āntarasa plays. The Bhartṛharinirveda Nāṭaka of Harihara (Kāvyamālā) is a S'ānta play of a conception far superior to other specimens though the author is somewhat unequal to the theme. The Prastāvanā says that it is a S'ānta play and that the S'āntarasa is the only lasting Rasa.

श्रीहरिहरप्रणीतेन भर्तृहरिनिर्वेदनाम्ना शान्तरसप्रधानेन नाटकेन तानुपासितुमीहे ।

श्रृङ्गारादिरनेकजन्ममरणश्रेणीसमासादितैः
एणीदृक्प्रमुखैः स्वदीपकसखैरालम्बनैरार्जितैः ।
अस्त्येव क्षणिको रसः प्रतिपलं पर्यन्तवैरस्यभूः
ब्रह्माद्वैतसुखात्मकः परमविश्रान्तो हि शान्तो रसः ॥ २ ॥

Author: Mansālkaṭṭi Vedāntācārya. Br. Mu. Prt. Bks. Cat. 1892-1906, Col. 525: Rājarājavarman's Gairvāṇīvijaya is another strange play in one act on the foundation of Sanskrit Schools in Travancore.]

Even in dramas on Rāma, Kṛṣṇa and S'iva, which are very large in number, there is Bhakti and through it S'ānta as the ultimate Rasa, though the drama by itself has a different and definite Rasa in its theme. For, it is devotion to these forms of God that prompted the poets to write and it is devotion that is the result in the hearts of the Sāmājikas. The actual Rasa of the play in such cases will thus be a Rasavat, subordinated to Bhakti and S'ānta which form the Paramadhvani.

The S'ānta is accepted by a majority of writers. The earliest writer now known to mention it is Udbhaṭa. He simply mentions it in his K.A.S.S. but must have dealt with it at greater length, perhaps refuting the opposition to it also in his now lost commentary on the Nāṭya s'āstra. Lollaṭa certainly recognised it, for as will be seen in a further section of this book, Lollaṭa recognises numerous Rasas. If he had admitted many minor Bhāvas as Rasas, he must certainly have admitted S'ānta, which his predecessor had accepted.

" तेन आनन्त्येऽपि रसानां पार्षदप्रसिद्ध्या एतावतामेव प्रयोज्यत्वमिति यत् भट्टलोल्लटेन निरूपितम्, तदवलेपना परामृश्य (?) इत्यलम्।"

Abhi. Bhā. Gaek. Edn. I, p. 299 (also on p. 341).

But Lollaṭa seems to have made a compromise with the no-changers in the number of Rasas by creating 'Pārṣadaprasiddhi' as certifying only a few as Rasas. This vogue in circles of connoisseurs, Lollaṭa says, speaks *only of these* as Rasas, as capable of portrayal on the stage (Prayojya): The 'these only' (Etāvatām eva) in Lollaṭa perhaps refer only to the old eight. That S'ānta also is included and the 'these' refers to nine has to be confirmed by a more definite evidence. We have no clue to know S'aṅkuka's attitude towards S'ānta. From the number of views on the Sthāyin of S'ānta which

Abhinava reviews and which must have been the views of the previous commentators of Bharata, we can guess that S'aṅkuka also accepted S'ānta. Rudraṭa recognises S'ānta and gives Samyagjñāna or Tattvajñāna as its Prakṛti or Sthāyin. Ch. VII, 3. He describes it in S'ls. 15-16, in Ch. XV :

सम्यग्ज्ञानप्रकृतिः शान्तो विगतेच्छनायको भवति ।
सम्यग्ज्ञानं विषये तमसो रागस्य चापगमात् ॥
जन्मजरामरणादित्रासो वैराग्यवासना विषये ।
सुखदुःखयोरनिच्छाद्वेषाविति तत्र जायन्ते ॥

" सम्यग्ज्ञानं स्थायिभावः । विभावस्तु शब्दादिविषयस्वरूपम् । अनुभावो जन्मादित्रासादयः ।" Namisādhu, p. 166. K.M. No. 2.

Namisādhu adds that it is improper to deny the existence of S'ānta as a Rasa.

" कैश्चिच्छान्तस्य रसत्वं नेष्टम् । तदयुक्तम् । भावादिकारणानामत्रापि विद्यमानत्वात् ।" *ibid.*

Ānanda recognises the S'ānta, illustrates it with the Nāgānanda and gives तृष्णाक्षयसुख as its Sthāyin. Rājas'ekhara's Kāvyamīmāṁsa might have recognised the S'ānta in its lost chapter called Rasādhikārika, since Rājas'ekhara follows Rudraṭa to a large extent. Bhaṭṭa Tota accepts it and from a remark of Abhinava at the end of the S'ānta section in the Locana, we see that Tota's Kāvyakautuka contains an elaborate examination of the objections to S(ānta and gives a brilliant exposition of it as the greatest Rasa.

'मोक्षफलत्वेन चायं परमपुरुषार्थनिष्ठत्वात् सर्वरसेभ्यः प्रधानतमः । स चायमस्मदुपाध्यायभट्टतोतेन काव्यकौतुके, अस्माभिश्च तद्विवरणे बहुतरकृतनिर्णयः पूर्वपक्षसिद्धान्त इत्यलं बहुना ।' p. 178.

Abhinava accepts it as the greatest Rasa in his three works, his lost commentary on his teacher's Kāvyakautuka, his Locana and his Abhinavabhāratī. Abhinava's predecessor and ancestor, the author of the Candrikā on the Dhvanyāloka, accepts the S'ānta but gives the ruling that it can appear as an element in the subsidiary plot of the drama but never as the leading Rasa. (Locana, p. 178). This has been pointed out already. The view of the Candrikā represents one stage in the history of S'ānta. It grants that S'ānta is a Rasa but holds it still unworthy of the honour of being the leading Rasa. The next stage is the recognition of it as an Ādhikārika Rasa, but permissible as an Ādhikārika Rasa only in a Kāvya; in Nāṭya, it should only be a Prāsaṅgika Rasa. The next stage is its complete acceptance, as Ādhikārika in Nāṭya also, and as the greatest of all Rasas, synthesising all the other Rasas in itself. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka accepts it and, like Abhinava, holds it as the greatest Rasa. Taking the very first verse of the Nāṭya s'āstra—नाट्यशास्त्रं प्रवक्ष्यामि ब्रह्मणा यदुदाहृतम्—Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka imaginatively interprets this as suggesting the S'ānta Rasa.[1] 'Brahmaṇā yad udāhṛtam' does not mean the S'āstra which was delivered by Brahmā, but Drama which is compared to the Brahman or the Absolute of Vedānta. The Naṭa is like the Brahman; upon him is created the world of drama, as this world upon the substratum of the Brahman. Drama is Māyā and the nature of its reality is Anirvacanīya. Though fundamentally non-existent in the sense in which the Naṭa and the Brahman exist as realities, both this world and Drama do exist. Both help to the attainment of the Puruṣārthas. The essence of this view is given by him in his Maṅgalas'loka to his now lost Hṛdayadarpaṇa. *See* pp. 4-5. Abhi. Bhā. Gaek.

[1] *Vide* J. O. R., Vol. VI, p. 211, my article, Writers quoted in the Abhinavabhāratī.

Edn. I. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka seems to have accepted as genuine the S'ānta text found in Bharata.

"—शान्तरसाक्षेपोऽयं भविष्यति 'स्वं स्वं निमित्तमासाद्य शान्तादुत्पद्यते रसः' इति । तदनेन पारमार्थिकं प्रयोजनमुक्तम्" इति व्याख्यानं हृदयदर्पणे पर्यग्रहीत् । यदाह—

'नमस्त्रैलोक्यनिर्माणकवये शम्भवे यतः ।
प्रतिक्षणं जगन्नाट्यप्रयोगरसिको जनः ॥' इति ।

Kṣemendra accepts it as can be seen from his Aucityavicāra-carcā, pp. 130-1. Following Abhinava and Ānanda, he considers S'ānta as the Rasa of the Bhārata. *See* S'l. 3 at the end of his Bhāratamañjarī. While Ānanda considers Karuṇa as the Rasa of the Rāmāyaṇa, Kṣemendra considers that the Karuṇa itself is the argument for S'ānta being the ultimate Rasa. *See* S'l. 1 at the end of his Rāmāyaṇamañjarī. S'ānta is the Rasa of Kṣemendra's Bauddhāvadānakalpalatā and some of his minor works, Darpadalana, etc. Bhoja accepts it both in his S. K. Ā. and S'ṛ. Pra. Most of the later writers accept it.

The writers who do not accept S'ānta are mainly writers on Dramaturgy proper. They think they are loyal to Bharata by denying it. The attitude begins (as far as we know now) in the Das'arūpaka, the model and source for many a later work on Rūpaka. Dhanañjaya and Dhanika, both refute it and argue for its impossibility in drama.

शममपि केचित् प्राहुः पुष्टिर्नाट्येषु नैतस्य ।[1] D. R. IV, 35.

[1] D. T. Tātācārya, M.O.L., misunderstands this S'ama, the Bhāva which is given here as the Sthāyin of S'ānta, as something having nothing to do with S'ānta and as something new and distinct

From this it would appear that Dhanañjaya denies S'ānta only in drama but accepts it in Kāvya. But, as a matter of fact, Dhanañjaya, as interpreted by Dhanika, does not recognise it even in Kāvya. *See* p. 124. Mammaṭa first says that the Nāṭya Rasas are only the eight given by Bharata, but adds afterwards that there is also a ninth Rasa called S'ānta with Nirveda as its Sthāyin, K. Pra. IV. S'ls. 6 and 12. S'āradātanaya denies it in Nāṭya, following one set of writers who opine that Brahmā gave only eight Rasas but subsequently mentions the S'ānta as accepted by Vāsuki. S'iṅgabhūpāla recognises only eight Rasas in drama and refutes Bhoja for holding S'ānta also as a Rasa, R.A.S. II, p. 171, T.S.S.

Some of the writers on Nāṭya seem to be anxious to object to S'ānta only in drama, since, in drama which requires the action of a Rasa through its Anubhāvas, there is no possibility of acting S'ānta Rasa, which, according to them, is devoid of all activity. The S'ravyakāvya however can describe the S'ānta Rasa, for what cannot be acted can at least be described. The D. R. Avaloka proposes :

'ननु शान्तरसस्य अनभिनेयत्वात् यद्यपि नाट्येऽनुप्रवेशो नास्ति, तथापि सूक्ष्मातीतादिवस्तूनां सर्वेषामपि शब्दप्रतिपाद्यताया विद्यमानत्वात् काव्यविषयत्वं न वार्यते ।' p. 124.

And even this Dhanika does not grant. For he says that such a state as S'ama is the very negation of the possibility of affirming anything of it. For, whatever way in which we can describe it is incorrect in so far as we are always describing in worldly terms something which is not like anything of this

from S'ānta. He says incorrectly : " Dhanañjaya seems to accept S'ama as distinct from S'ānta rasa, which, he thinks, has no place in drama." (J.O.R., Vol. V, p. 28.)

world. The Upaniṣads themselves describe the Brahman by saying that It is not this, not this. Such a state can never be made the subject of Kāvya even.

" शान्तो हि तावत्—

' [1]न यत्र दुःखं न सुखं न चिन्ता न द्वेषरागौ न च काचिदिच्छा ।
रसस्तु शान्तः कथितो मुनीन्द्रैः सर्वेषु भावेषु शमप्रधानः ॥ '

इत्येवंलक्षणः, तदा तस्य मोक्षावस्थायामेव आत्मस्वरूपापत्तिलक्षणायां प्रादुर्भावात् तस्य च स्वरूपेण अनिर्वचनीयता । तथा हि श्रुतिरपि स एष नेति नेति अन्यापोहरूपेणाह ।" D. R. A., p. 124.

This objection of the indescribability of S'ānta and the impossibility of enacting it has already been answered. *See* above. The Sukha which is said to be absent in that state refers to worldly joy. Vis'vanātha thus replies to Dhanika :

" युक्तवियुक्तदशायामवस्थितो यः शमः स एव यतः ।
रसतामेति तदस्मिन् सञ्चार्यादेः स्थितिश्च न विरुद्धा ॥ "
S.D., III, 250.

" यश्चास्मिन् सुखाभावोऽप्युक्तः, तस्य वैषयिकसुखपरत्वात् न विरोधः " । *ibid.* III (under Kārikā 249).

Vedāntades'ika also has answered this and other objections to the S'ānta in the prologue to his Saṅkalpasūryodaya. *See* D. T. Tatacharya, J. O. R., Vol. V, pp. 32-3, where the passage from Vedāntades'ika is quoted in full.

To grant it in Kāvya and to deny it in Nāṭya is as clumsy a compromise as the one which grants it inherent

[1] This is evidently a verse from an old writer who accepted the S'ānta and described it in these terms.

Rasatva and denies it conventional vogue as a Rasa. Kāvya is, in essence, only drama and this Abhinava has emphasised in his Abhinava-bhāratī.[1] If it is possible to develop it as the theme of a Kāvya, equally is it possible to handle it as the motif of a drama.

There are other writers who are not so antagonistic towards S'ānta as to deny it totally. They are not Abhāvavādins but are Antarbhāvavādins. The aspect called the quietistic is no doubt available in Kāvya and Nāṭya but one need not recognise it as a special and separate Rasa with the name S'ānta which Bharata does not speak of. We can have it and relish it as a variety of one of the Rasas already given by Bharata. Thus, for instance, some writers include S'ānta in Vīra and say that S'ānta is nothing but Dayāvīra. This view cannot however explain all cases of S'ānta but it owes its origin to the fact that it was Nāgānanda that was at first kept in view by the sponsors and adversaries of S'ānta. Others try to include it in Jugupsā. Inclusion in many other Bhāvas is possible as will be shown in the section on the Sthāyin of S'ānta. But in all these cases the Antarbhāvavādins mistake a Sañcārin, though an Ābhyantara one, for the Sthāyin. Vīra, as emphasising Ego, as Ahaṅkārapradhāna, can go ill with S'ānta which is the very negation of Ahaṅkāra. If there are certain varieties of selfless Vīra like Dayāvīra, Dharmavīra and Dānavīra, they must be brought under the Mahāviṣaya, *viz.*, the S'ānta and not *vice versa*. So also Jugupsā, etc.[2]

[1] Abhi. Bhā., Gaek. Edn., I, p. 292.

[2] *See* Sāhityadarpaṇa, III.

निरहङ्काररूपत्वाद्दयावीरादिरेष नो ।

Again

सर्वाकारमहङ्काररहितत्वं व्रजन्ति चेत् ।
अत्रान्तर्भावमर्हन्ति दयावीरादयस्तदा ॥

These are at best very prominent and frequently appearing accessories. We can say:

कस्यचिच्छान्तभेदस्य स तु स्यादुपलक्षणम् ।

Dayāvīra, etc. may be some cases of S'ānta, not all cases of S'ānta. S'ānta comprehends all the forty-nine Bhāvas as its Vyabhicārins. It cannot be included in anything. शुद्धजुगुप्सा, दयावीर, विचित्ररत्यादिस्थाय्यष्टक—these are, each of them, a kind or a case of S'ānta; they cannot define S'ānta. If in spite of the fundamental difference between S'ama and Utsāha, some want to include S'ānta in Vīra, because both have Utsāha of a Sāttvika form in them, all the Rasas can be included in Vīra, for there is hardly any activity without Utsāha. If because of the Sāttvika nature of the Utsāha in S'ānta and Vīra, the two are made into one, well can Vīra and Raudra be made into one, because both carry out the destruction of the enemy. This Antarbhāvavāda is dealt with at greater length in the section on the Sthāyin of S'ānta.

S'ānta is the Rasa of S'ama, or Tattvajñāna or realisation of Ātman. The whole world may be its Uddīpanavibhāva. Its Ālambanavibhāva is, in cases of Bhakti or devotion, a personal God, and in other cases, the Ātman or the Brahman. Those who have accepted S'ānta give it all the Rasa-details which Bharata gives to other Rasas, *viz.*, its Varṇa (colour), Devatā (presiding deity), Vṛtti, Guṇa, etc. The original text of Bharata on the Rasa-devatās reads 'अद्भुतो ब्रह्मदैवतः' VI, 50. Abhinava says that according to the S'ānta-advocates, the text reads thus: "वीरो महेन्द्रदेवः स्यात् बुद्धः शान्तोऽब्जजोऽद्भुतः" इति शान्तवादिनः केचित् पठन्ति । बुद्धो जिनः परोपकारैकपरः, प्रबुद्धो वा ।" Abhi. Bhā., Gaek. Edn., I, p. 300. Abhinava says that either the Buddha or the enlightened soul in general is

the Devatā of S'ānta. The mention of Buddha in the amended text is tell-tale and shows the hand of some writer like Rāhula. It confirms our surmise in an earlier section of this book that the Buddhists might have ushered the S'ānta in. It is natural that Vis'vanātha clearly stated Nārāyaṇa as the Devatā of S'ānta—S'ri Nārāyaṇadaivaḥ. The Alaṅkārasarvasva of Harṣopādhyāya (?), written for one Gopāladeva, makes the supreme spirit, Para Brahman, as the Devatā of S'ānta.[1] Regarding the colour of S'ānta, one naturally expects it to be pure white, to be in consonance with the purity and knowledge that characterise it. Vis'vanātha says of it—Kundendusundaracchāyaḥ. So also did Abhinava say: according to him, advocates of S'ānta changed the text 'पीतश्श्वेत्राद्भुतः स्मृतः' into 'स्वच्छपीतौ शमाद्भुतौ'. "स्वच्छपीतौ शमाद्भुतौ" इति शान्तवादिनां पाठः". Gaek. Edn., I, p. 299. The Vṛtti of S'ānta is given by Abhinava as the Sāttvatī, because the Sāttvatī vṛtti is described by him as full of Sattvaguṇa.[2] 'शान्ते तु सात्त्वत्येव वृत्तिरिति—.' Abhi. Bhā., Gaek. Edn., I, p. 341. But, correctly speaking, the real Vṛtti of S'ānta cannot be any of the four or can be any one of the four in the several situations according to the Vyabhicārins. Thus in the case of a drama involving Bhakti or devotion to a personal God, the Vṛtti is Kais'ikī.

The Saṅgītasudhākara of king Haripāladeva (Madras MS.)[3] which, as will be seen presently, accepts S'ānta as a

[1] Madras Govt. Ori. MSS. Library, Triennial Catalogues, 1910-1922, R. No. 3325.

[2] Regarding this false etymology, of Sāttvatī from Sattva, *see* my article on the Vṛttis, J. O. R., Vol. VII, pp. 38-44.

[3] Triennial Catalogue, Madras Govt. Ori. MSS. Library, R. Nos. 779 (Chs. 1-2) and 3082 (Chs. 3-6). *See* J. O. R., Vol. VII, pp. 102-4, my article on the Vṛttis. Also, pp. 21-3, Vol. IV, Journal of the Madras Music Academy, my article on Later

less basic Rasa and introduces a permanent quietistic Rasa called Brāhma, which latter corresponds to the S'ānta of others, postulates the Vṛtti of this basic Brāhmarasa as the Brāhmī vṛtti. In the fight of Viṣṇu with the two demons, Madhu and Kaiṭabha, in which incident arose the four Vṛttis, Brahmā was a spectator and Haripāla makes this Taṭastha Brahmā the source of his Brāhmī vṛtti. This Vṛtti he ascribes not only to the Brāhma rasa, but to S'ānta and Adbhuta also. Brahmā is the Devatā of Adbhuta in the old text of Bharata also. Brahmā is thus the Devatā of S'ānta and Brāhma Rasas according to Haripāla:

अधिष्ठाय रसानेतान् पञ्चाजायन्त वृत्तयः ।
कैशिक्यारभटी **ब्राह्मी** सात्त्वती भारती तथा ॥

. . . . . .

ब्राह्मी नाम भवेद्वृत्तिः ब्राह्मशान्तादभुताश्रया ।
ब्राह्मी ब्रह्मोद्भवा तत्र शेषा नारायणोद्भवाः ॥ Mad. MS., p. 19.

Regarding the Guṇa of S'ānta: Ānanda says that Mādhurya is the Guṇa of S'ṛṅgāra (Sambhoga), Vipralambha, and Karuṇa. This Guṇa is sweetness and the melting of the heart. Really speaking this Mādhurya applicable to worldly sweetness or Cittadruti of a worldly nature cannot apply to S'ānta. Perhaps Prasāda may fit S'ānta, for, above all, S'ama is the tranquillity and transparence of the Cittavṛtti or Antaḥkaraṇa which has become tarnished with the dust of this world. Prasāda which shows the total absence of Rāga and Dveṣa is the nearest

Saṅgīta Literature. MSS. of Haripāla's Saṅgītasudhākara are available in the Adyar (Cat. II, p. 46b), Tanjore (Nos. 10804-6) and Mysore (Cat. I, 378, entry 7, where there is some mistake) Libraries.

approach to the Taṭasthatā of S'ānta. But Hemacandra considers that in S'ānta, Mādhurya exists in a high degree.

'द्रुतिहेतुर्माधुर्यं श्रृङ्गारे । शान्तकरुणविप्रलम्भेषु सातिशयम् ।'
K. A. IV, p. 201.

'सातिशयमिति—अत्यन्तद्रुतिहेतुत्वात् ।' Com. *ibid.*

Jagannātha also views similarly. He gives the greatest amount of Mādhurya as present in S'ānta.

"तत्र श्रृङ्गारे संयोगाख्ये यन्माधुर्यं ततोऽतिशयितं करुणे, ताभ्यां विप्रलम्भे, तेभ्योऽपि शान्ते ।" R. G., p. 53.

In this respect, both Hemacandra and Jagannātha only follow Mammaṭa who says:

आह्लादकत्वं माधुर्यं श्रृङ्गारे द्रुतिकारणम् ।
करुणे विप्रलम्भे तच्छान्ते चातिशयान्वितम् ॥ Kā. Pra., VIII, 3.

These writers seem to have in their mind the state of Brahmāsvāda or the realisation of Ānanda, that being the end of S'ānta rasa. Surely bliss unalloyed is sweetest.

III

In this section I propose to speak of some peculiar and original views expressed by some writers on the S'ānta Rasa.

The Rasakalikā of Rudrabhaṭṭa

In the section on the Sthāyin of S'ānta it will be seen that Nirveda, Tṛṣṇākṣayasukha, Vairāgya, Tattvajñāna, etc. make their claim to be the Sthāyin of S'ānta. Each of these helps the other and shades off into the other. All of them form aspects of the one Rasa of S'ānta. So it seems to Rudrabhaṭṭa, the author of the Rasakalikā, an unpublished work on Rasa preserved in two parts in two MSS. in the Govt. Oriental Library, Madras (Nos. R. 2241 and 3274)[1]. He says first that

[1] The two MSS. make the work almost complete; but there still seems to be some portion missing. On p. 32 of R. 2241, there is a Cāṭu on a king named Arjuna. This Rasakalikā is identical with the Rasakalikā which is quoted by Vāsudeva in his commentary on the Karpūramañjarī (K. M. Edn.). All the six verses cited by Vāsudeva are found in the Rasakalikā in these Madras MSS. There are two copies, an original and a transcript, of the Rasakalikā in the Mysore Oriental Library.

There is no indication of the author in the MSS. of this work. But we are able to know that one Rudrabhaṭṭa was its author from the external evidenec of a Kanarese treatise on Rasa, the Rasaratnākara of Sālva (16th cent.). Sālva says that he draws upon Amṛtānanda, Hemacandra, Rudrabhaṭṭa and Vaidyanātha. While dealing with the Uddīpana-Vibhāvas, Sālva says that Rudrabhaṭṭa mentions them as four in his Rasakalikā (p. 11, Rasaratnākara, Madras University Kanarese Series, No. 9, Ed. by A. Venkat Rao and Pandit H. Sesha Ayyangar). On pp. 188-2 of this edn., is found an appendix containing all the passages of the Rasakalikā quoted by Sālva.

S'ama is the Sthāyin of S'ānta (R. 2241, p. 7) and then describes on p. 9 that S'ama is the untinted, rippleless state of the mind which is acquired through Vairāgya, etc.

" शमो वैराग्यादिना निर्विकारचित्तत्वम् । यथा—

' अशीमहि वयं भिक्षाम् आशावासो वसीमहि ।

शयीमहि महीपृष्ठे कुर्वीमहि किमीश्वरैः ॥ ' " p. 9, R. 2241.

What other things does he mean besides Vairāgya when he says '*Vairāgya-ādinā* ?' He explains on p. 47. He says that even as Vīra is of the forms of Dāna-, Dayā-, Yuddha- and Dharma-Vīra, S'ānta also has four Prakāras or phases or forms : Vairāgya, Doṣanigraha, Santoṣa and Tattvasākṣātkāra.

" अथ शान्तः—

विषयेभ्यो विरक्तस्य तत्त्वज्ञस्य विवेकिनः ।

रागादिनिर्विकारत्वं शान्तिरित्यभिधीयते ॥

सा चतुर्विधा—वैराग्यम् , दोषनिग्रहः, सन्तोषः, तत्त्वसाक्षात्कारिता चेति । "

" विषयेभ्यो निवृत्तिर्वैराग्यम् . . . . । रागाद्यभावो दोषनिग्रहः . . . . । तृष्णोन्मूलनं सन्तोषः . . . . । तत्त्वसाक्षात्कारः ॥ " pp. 47-48.

Here Vairāgya and the other three are spoken of not as means to S'ama but as forms of S'ama or S'ānta itself.

THE SAṄGĪTASUDHĀKARA OF HARIPĀLADEVA

Unlike most of the later writers, king Haripāla boldly wrote on independent lines, creating new concepts. He accepts thirteen Rasas : the old eight of Bharata, S'ānta, Vātsalya (which comes down from Rudraṭa's time), and three absolutely new Rasas, Sambhoga, Vipralambha and Brāhma. He expressly says that the last three are new and distinct Rasas according to his view.

शृङ्गारो हास्यनामा च बीभत्सः करुणस्तथा ।

वीरो भयानकाह्वानो रौद्राख्योऽद्भुतसंज्ञकः ॥

शान्तो ब्राह्माभिधः पश्चाद् वात्सल्याख्यस्ततः परम् ।

सम्भोगो विप्रलम्भः स्याद् रसास्त्वेते त्रयोदश ॥

P. 16, Madras MS. R. 3082 (Ch. IV).

What his new Rasas, Sambhoga and Vipralambha, are and how they differ from the first, *viz.*, S'ṛṅgāra—these questions will be taken up in another section. Now we shall restrict ourselves to Haripāla's views on the new Rasa named Brāhma which he holds in addition to (and not in the place of) the S'ānta. What are these two Rasas, Brāhma and S'ānta and how do they differ ? What are their respective and distinct Sthāyins ? What is the necessity for recognising two such Rasas ?

Haripāla gives the Sthāyins of his Rasas thus :

आह्लादः प्रथमं नर्म[1] जुगुप्सा शोक एव च ॥

उत्साहदैन्य[2]क्रोधोऽथ विस्मयस्तदनन्तरम् ।

निर्वेदश्च तथानन्दः प्रीती रत्यरती तथा ॥

प्रत्येकं स्थायिनो भावाः क्रमात् प्रत्येकमीरिताः । p. 17, *ibid.*

He accepts the view that Nirveda is the Sthāyin of S'ānta and in this acceptance, he seems to have a purpose which

[1] *Narma* means *Hāsa*.
[2] *Bhaya* is the old Sthāyin of Bhayānaka.

we shall see presently. Haripāla says further on these Rasas:

सम्भोगो विप्रलम्भश्च ब्राह्मश्चेति त्रयो रसाः ।
अतिरिक्ता उदीर्यन्ते हरिपालमहीभुजा ॥ p. 17.

. . . . . .

ब्राह्मो नाम रसः सर्वप्रपञ्चोत्तीर्णरूपकः ।
नित्यः स्थिरोऽत एवायं पार्थक्येन प्रकीर्तितः ॥ p. 18.

From the latter verse we have to take that Haripāla distinguishes the S'ānta and the Brāhma Rasas as differing in the degree of permanence. He calls the Brāhma, of which Ānanda is given as the Sthāyin, eternal (Nitya) and permanent (Sthira), and from this we have to understand that the S'ānta of which Nirveda is the Sthāyin is impermanent (Anitya and Asthira). While discussing the claims of Nirveda born of Tattvajñāna to be the Sthāyin of S'ānta, Abhinava quotes the verse वृथा दुग्धोऽनड्वान् etc. and points out that the resulting Bhāva is Kheda or Nirveda in ordinary things in the sphere of our mundane activities, which has no reference to the fourth Puruṣārtha, Mokṣa. This Nirveda can be developed into a Rasa which is a kind of quietude, S'ānta. Perhaps, it is to distinguish such a Rasa as this Nirveda-S'ānta involving a passive attitude towards mundane matters, that Haripāla postulated a Brāhma rasa to refer to a regular activity towards the attainment of Mokṣa. No such explanation is however offered by Haripāla. The above suggested explanation loses point when it is realised that a Nirveda in ordinary things must only be a Bhāva and if it is nourished into a Rasa, it cannot stop short without developing into a Rasa referring to Mokṣa. It is a pity that Haripāla has not explained himself more elaborately.

THE PRAPAÑCAHṚDAYA

The Prapañcahṛdaya, an anonymous compendium, published as No. XLV of the Trivandrum Skt. Series, treats of the subject of Rasa under Nāṭya, in the section on the Gāndharva Veda, in the chapter on the Upavedas. The work approaches S'ānta in a new manner. It says that there are only eight Sthāyins but opines that the Nāṭyas'āstra gives nine Rasas! It thus gives eight Sthāyins and nine Rasas. It refutes those who hold S'ānta as the negation of the other eight and holds it as the cessation of all the senses, Sarva-indriya-uparama. But what exactly is the S'ānta, it does not say.

"तदेतत् (नाट्यम्) अष्टभावानां नवरसानाम् आश्रयभूतम् । ते च प्रदर्शिताः—

'रतिर्हासश्च शोकश्च क्रोधोत्साहौ भयं तथा ।
जुगुप्सा विस्मयश्चैवेत्यष्टौ भावाः प्रकीर्तिताः ॥
शृङ्गारहास्यकरुणा वीररौद्रभयानकाः ।
बीभत्साद्भुतशान्ताश्च नव नाट्यरसाः स्मृताः ॥'

इति । तत्राष्टौ भावाः पूर्वरूपाः । तदुत्तररूपा नवरसाः । . . . तदष्टभावानामभावो नवम इति केचिदाहुः । तदसमञ्जसम् । नाट्यशास्त्रे नवरसानामभ्युपगमात् । अतः सर्वेन्द्रियोपरमलक्षणः शान्तो नवमरसः ।"
pp. 55—56.

How can one speak of a Rasa without a Sthāyin?

THE ANUYOGADVĀRA SŪTRA

The Anuyogadvārasūtra with the Skt. gloss of Maladhāri Hemacandra (Āgamodaya Samiti Series) deals with the nine

Rasas of Kāvya, p. 134 ff. The gloss first explains the Pras'ānta Rasa thus:

'प्रशाम्यति क्रोधादिजनितौत्सुक्यरहितो भवत्यनेनेति प्रशान्तः। परम-गुरुवचःश्रवणादिहेतुसमुल्लसित **उपशमप्रकर्षात्मा** प्रशान्तो रस इत्यलं विस्तरेण'।

The text describes and illustrates the Pras'ānta thus:

निद्दोसमणसमाहाणसंभवो जो पसंतभावेणम् ।
अविकारलक्खणो सो रसो पसंतो त्ति णायव्वो ॥

पसन्तो रसो जहा—

सब्भावनिव्विगारं उवसंतपसंतसोमदिट्ठीअम् ।
ही जह मुणिणो सोहइ मुहकमलं पीवरसिरीअम् ॥

छाया

निर्दोषमनःसमाधानसम्भवो यः प्रशान्तभावेन ।
अविकारलक्षणः स रसः प्रशान्त इति ज्ञातव्यः ॥

प्रशान्तो रसो यथा—

सद्भावनिर्विकारम् उपशान्तप्रशान्तसौम्यदृष्टीकम् ।
पश्य यथा मुनेः शोभते मुखकमलं पीवरश्रीकम् ॥

Besides this Pras'ānta Rasa, the commentator explains that the Vīrarasa in the text has two sublime varieties called Tyāgavīra and Tapovīra, both of which are superior to the third variety called Yuddhavīra. It further explains that Tyāgavīra, Tapovīra and the Pras'ānta are Rasas which are not brought into existence by any "Sūtradoṣas" like Anṛta, Parahiṁsā, etc. Yuddhavīra involves Paropaghāta, destruction of others; Adbhuta is roused by 'hyperbole', Atis'ayokti, which is a species of falsehood. More of this later.

IV

THE STHĀYIN OF S'ĀNTA

WHEN it is said that Bharata did not speak of the S'ānta Rasa, it follows that he did not mention any Sthāyin which developed into that Rasa. One of the chief arguments of those who do not accept S'ānta is that Bharata did not give its Sthāyin. Says the Locana:

"'ननु नास्त्येव शान्तो रसः। तस्य तु स्थाय्येव नोपदिष्टो मुनिना' इत्याशङ्क्याह ॥" p. 176.

1. S'ama.

The reply to this objection to S'ānta must show that not only is a S'ānta Rasa possible from a Sthāyin like S'ama, but also that the Sthāyin is available in Bharata's text itself. So certain writers who held S'āma as the Sthāyin of S'ānta interfered with Bharata's text. The result of this interference is seen in three places. The first two are emendations of Bharata's Anuṣṭubhs enumerating the Rasas and the Sthāyins.

"शृङ्गार + बीभत्साद्भुतसंज्ञौ **चेत्यष्टौ** नाट्ये रसाः स्मृताः"

became "शृङ्गार + बीभत्साद्भुत**शान्ताश्च नव** नाट्ये रसाः स्मृताः"। And "जुगुप्सा विस्मयश्चेति स्थायिभावाः प्रकीर्तिताः" was read as "जुगुप्साविस्मय**शमाः** स्थायिभावाः प्रकीर्तिताः ॥"

Abhinava has these remarks on these two texts :

"शान्तापलापिनस्तु अष्टाविति तत्र पठन्ति ।"

"तत्र शान्तस्य स्थायी 'विस्मयशमाः' इति कैश्चित् पठितः ।"

Gaek. Edn., Vol. I, p. 269.

The third case of interference is a complete interpolation of a section on S'ānta in Ch. V1. (Gaek. Edn., I, p. 333.) The Kāvyamālā and the Kās'ī editions of the N. S'. do not have the section on S'ānta in Ch. VI. In this interpolated section, S'ama is given as the Sthāyin of S'ānta :

"अथ शान्तो नाम शमस्थायिभावात्मको मोक्षप्रवर्तकः ॥"

That this section was absent in certain MSS. and that certain recensions counted only eight Rasas is known from Abhinava's own remarks. Abhinava says :

"तथा च चिरन्तनपुस्तकेषु स्थायिभावान् रसत्वमुपनेष्याम इत्यनन्तरम् 'शान्तो नाम शमस्थायिभावात्मकः' इत्यादिशान्तलक्षणं पठ्यते ॥"

Gaek. Edn., I, p. 340.

This remark will make it clear that the section on S'ānta Rasa is not exactly the end of Chapter VI as now found in the Gaek. edn., but the beginning of the section treating of all the Rasas, *i.e.* before the subsection on S'ṛṅgāra. There is no doubt on this point that the section on S'ānta opened the section on Rasas and appeared even before S'ṛṅgāra, in some old MSS. which Abhinava consulted. For Abhinava makes an additional score out of this priority of S'ānta in the treatment of Rasas. He says that it is because the Sthāyin of S'ānta is Sthāyin *par excellence,* being the Ātman itself on which arise the comparatively less basic Sthāyins Rati, etc., and because all Rasāsvāda is of the form of

S'ānta, being Alaukika and free from worldly links, S'ānta is the greatest Rasa and hence it is that it is dealt with at the very beginning.

"—इत्यस्य (शान्तस्य) सर्वप्रकृतित्वाभिधानाय पूर्वमभिधानम् ।"

Gaek. Edn., I, p. 340.

Who may be the author responsible for introducing the S'ānta texts in the N. S'.? It is not possible to say anything definite. All we know now is that Udbhaṭa, the earliest of the now known regular commentators on Bharata, accepts the S'ānta as is seen from his K. A. S. S. which however mentions not its Sthāyin. Pratīhārendurāja gives the Sthāyins and he speaks of S'ama as the Sthāyin of S'ānta.

For those who believe in the genuineness of these texts on S'ānta as Bharata's own, there is no difficulty in answering the objection that S'ānta cannot be accepted for the reason that Bharata did not mention at all its Sthāyin. For according to them, Bharata gave nine Rasas, mentioned S'ama as the Sthāyin of S'ānta and described S'ānta as the greatest Rasa.

One of the main objections against S'ama being accepted as the Sthāyin of S'ānta is that the texts which say so cannot be relied upon as genuine because of their absence in some recensions. Also because of the fact that the S'ama here spoken of would make the number of Bhāvas fifty and Bharata gives only forty-nine. Therefore some advocates of S'ānta put forward Nirveda as the Sthāyin, Nirveda being one of the forty-nine given by Bharata. These advocates of Nirveda did not however criticise S'ama. Another objection, an imaginary one, is that S'ama and S'ānta are synonymous and the former cannot be the Sthāyin of the latter. S'ama and S'ānta differ even as Bhaya and Bhayānaka, Vismaya

and Adbhuta and Hāsa and Hāsya. The former is Laukika, the latter Alaukika. Says Abhinava:

शमशान्तयोः पर्यायत्वं तु हासहास्याभ्यां व्याख्यातम् । सिद्धसाध्यतया यद्लौकिकत्वेन (लौकिकालौकिकत्वेन) साधारणासाधारणतया च वैलक्षण्यं शमशान्तयोरपि सुलभमेव । Gaek. Edn., I, 336.

Both the above-mentioned objections to S'ama are thus set forth by Abhinava, earlier, as Pūrvapakṣa:

"एतदपरे न सहन्ते, शमशान्तयोः पर्यायत्वात् (१), एकान्नपञ्चाशद्भावा इति संख्यात्यागात् (२) ।" p. 333, *ibid.*

2. Samyagjñāna.

Rudraṭa comes next to Udbhaṭa in the discussion on the Sthāyin of S'ānta. He mentions S'ānta as a Rasa and gives its Sthāyin as Samyagjñāna. Namisādhu clearly says that Rudraṭa gives Samyagjñāna as the Sthāyin.

सम्यग्ज्ञानप्रकृतिः शान्तो विगतेच्छनायको भवति ।
सम्यग्ज्ञानं विषये तमसो रागस्य चापगमात् ॥ Ch. xvi, 15.
सम्यग्ज्ञानं स्थायिभावः—Namisādhu.

Evidently Rudraṭa did not rely on the S'ānta texts in Bharata's N. S'. but was bold enough to hold Rasas not mentioned by Bharata. So he left out S'ama and put forward Samyagjñāna as the Sthāyin of S'ānta. If Samyagjñāna means the realisation of the self, it becomes the causal antecedent of S'ama. Samyagjñāna is Tattvajñāna and all writers following Bharata have given it as one of the Vibhāvas of S'ama. But Namisādhu does not make any difference between Samyagjñāna and S'ama. Under Rudraṭa's verse enumerating the Rasas, Namisādhu enumerates the Sthāyins, the Vyabhicārins, etc. And here, he gives S'ama as the Sthāyin of S'ānta.

3. Tṛṣṇākṣaya-sukha.

We are not able to know what Bhāva was held as Sthāyin by Lollaṭa and S'aṅkuka. Some of the views on the Sthāyin of S'ānta mentioned in the Abhinavabhāratī may be the views of these two commentators. To those views we shall turn presently. Before that we shall examine the views of authors whose works are available to us. Ānandhavardhana accepts the S'ānta Rasa, criticises the views of the opponents of S'ānta and determines the character of this Rasa. He does not hold S'ama or Nirveda as its Sthāyin but gives Tṛṣṇākṣayasukha as its Sthāyin. He says:

'शान्तश्च तृष्णाक्षयसुखस्य यः परिपोषः तल्लक्षणो रसः प्रतीयत एव । तथा चोक्तम्—

"यच्च कामसुखं लोके यच्च दिव्यं महत् सुखम् ।
तृष्णाक्षयसुखस्यैते नार्हतः षोडशीं कलाम् ॥'"

III, Ud. p. 176, N. S. Edn.

The Locana:

"तृष्णानां विषयाणां यः क्षयः सर्वतोनिवृत्तिरूपः निरोधः तदेव सुखं तस्य यः स्थायीभूतस्य परिपोषः रस्यमानताकृतः तदेव लक्षणं यस्य स शान्तो रसः ॥"

This non-acceptance of S'ama shows that Ānandavardhana did not accept or follow the S'ānta text in Bharata. His Sthāyin for S'ānta is that happiness which is the cessation of all desires—Tṛṣṇā-kṣaya-sukha—and is inspired by Vyāsa, whose Mahābhārata Ānanda is going to expound as a S'ānta-epic in the next Uddyota of his work. If however we take this Tṛṣṇā as an Upalakṣaṇa for all Bhāvas, this Sthāyin will become identical with the S'ama or the Pras'ama

of all Cittavṛttis. That this Sthāyin also will, in some way, become a form of S′ama is accepted by Ānanda when he distinguishes the S′ānta from the Vīra in which certain opponents include the S′ānta. Ānanda says:

"अस्य च शान्तस्य अहङ्कारप्रशमैकरूपतया स्थितेः ।" p. 177.

And the Locana here interprets Ahaṅkārapras′ama as Nirīhatva. Hemacandra, a follower of Ānanda and Abhinava, equates Ānanda's Tṛṣṇākṣaya with S′ama:

"—तृष्णाक्षयरूपः शमः स्थायिभावः चर्वणां प्राप्तः शान्तो रसः ।"

K. A., p. 80.

4. Sarvacittavṛtti-pras′ama.

The Locana informs us that there were some who, not satisfied with Tṛṣṇākṣayasukha, gave the complete death of all the Cittavṛttis, the modifications of the mind, as the Sthāyin. Abhinava replies that if this is meant as a negative state, it can hardly be a Bhāva; for a negative state cannot be a state or Bhāva; if however it is meant as a positive state marked by the absence of all the Cittavṛttis, it comes to the same thing as that state of bliss which is marked by the annihilation of all desires.

अन्ये तु सर्वचित्तवृत्तिप्रशम एवास्य स्थायीति मन्यन्ते । तच्चासत्; भावस्य प्रसज्यप्रतिषेधरूपत्वे चेतोवृत्तित्वाभावेन भावत्वायोगात् । पर्युदासे तु अस्मत्पक्ष एवायम् ॥ Locana, p. 177 (Reconstructed).

5. Nirvis′eṣa-Cittavṛtti.

There are others, the Locana continues, who quote a verse from Bharata on S′ānta as the one basic Rasa of which the other Bhāvas are transformations and hold that state of the mind when it is itself and is free from any transforming condition, as the Sthāyin of S′ānta. Abhinava

says that this also differs only slightly from Tṛṣṇākṣaya. While Anupajātavis′eṣa-cittavṛtti is a state of Prāgabhāva of Tṛṣṇā etc., Tṛṣṇākṣaya refers to a state of the Pradhvaṁsābhāva of Tṛṣṇā etc. The extermination of Tṛṣṇā is the natural process; we see in experience the polluted Citta gradually clearing.

इति भरतवाक्यं दृष्टवन्तः सर्वरससामान्यस्वभावं शान्तमाचक्षाणा अनुपजातविशेषान्तरं चित्तवृत्तिरूपं शान्तस्य स्थायिभावं मन्यन्ते । p. 177.

6. Dhṛti.

Bhoja gives Dhṛti as the Sthāyin of S′ānta in his Sarasvaṭīkaṇṭhābharaṇa. pp. 514-515.

"—धृतिस्थायिभावः वस्तुतत्त्वालोचनादिभिः व्यभिचारिभावैः वागारम्भादिभिरनुषज्यमानः निष्पन्नः शान्त इत्यभिगीयते ।[1]

अन्ये पुनरस्य शमं प्रकृतिमामनन्ति, स तु धृतेरेव विशेषो भवति ।"

What is this Dhṛti? Dhṛti means Firmness, Contentment and Joy. All the three are pertinent. But Bhoja means only contentment, Santuṣṭi, for, his illustration is:

सर्वाः सम्पत्तयस्तस्य सन्तुष्टं यस्य मानसम् ।
उपानद्गूढपादस्य ननु चर्मास्तृतैव भूः ॥

This contentment again is not far off from Tṛṣṇākṣaya or S′ama. Bhoja mentions S′ama here as being held by others and he opines that it comes under Dhṛti. Perhaps the reason why Bhoja did not choose S′ama is that it is not found in Bharata's list of 49 Bhāvas. Dhṛti is found there. Elsewhere Bhoja gives the same S′ama as a variety of the Vyabhicārin called Mati. (p. 523) मतिविशेषः शमो यथा । Mati

[1] See also the Sāhitya mīmāmsa, TSS. 144, p. 59, where this view of Bhoja is noted. The S. M. itself does not accept the S′ānta.

has a variety called Tattvajñāna which is again not different from S'ama.[1] In the S'ṛṅgāraprakās'a Bhoja discards Dhṛti and holds S'ama as the Sthāyin.

"अत्र च शमप्रकृतिः शान्तः etc."

S'ṛ. pra. Maḍ. MS., Vol. II, pp. 377-8.

Dhṛti is mentioned by Bharata as a Vyabhicārin and in Ch. 7, Vijñāna, S'ruti, S'auca, Ācāra and Gurubhakti are mentioned among its Vibhāvas. These would properly come within the scope of the S'ānta Rasa. Earlier, in the first chapter itself, Bharata speaks of Dhṛti. While describing how variously Drama pleases persons of differing temperaments and moods, Bharata says that Drama gives Dhṛti to those whose minds are in anguish or are disturbed very much.

अर्थोपजीविनामर्थो धृतिरुद्विग्नचेतसाम् । Gaek. Edn., I, 112.

This Dhṛti may refer generally to the balm-like effect Drama has. Abhinava takes it as 'Dhairya', firmness of heart. This Dhṛti may refer in particular also to such dramas in which the production of Dhṛti in the audience is the special purpose of the drama. Such cases would be S'ānta-plays.

Many other Bhāvas are held as the Sthāyin of S'ānta by other writers. We come to know of these from the Abhinavabhāratī. We are not given in this work the names of the writers who held those views. The first of these Bhāvas to claim our attention is Nirveda. The almost only reason why certain writers hold Nirveda as the Sthāyin of S'ānta is their necessity to show the opponents of S'ānta Rasa that the Sthāyin of S'ānta is surely found in Bharata. They are not for holding

7. Nirveda.

[1] This Mati-variety is not that which Bhoja holds as the Sthāyin for his new Udātta Rasa on p. 515, S. K. Ā.

to S'ama, a Bhāva not to be found among Bharata's forty-nine Bhāvas. While Bhoja tried for some time to get over the difficulty by picking out Dhṛti from the 49, there were earlier writers who took the very first Vyabhicārin Nirveda and proposed to treat it as a Bhāva which was both Vyabhicārin and Sthāyin. The Abhinavabhāratī says:

"तत्त्वज्ञानजो निर्वेदोऽस्य स्थायी । एतदर्थमेव उभयधर्मोपजीवित्वख्यापनाय अमङ्गलभूतोऽप्यसौ पूर्वं निर्दिष्टः ।" Gaek. Edn., pp. 269-70.

"या चासौ तथाभूता (मोक्षाभिधानपरमपुरुषार्थोचिता) चित्तवृत्तिः सैवात्र (शान्ते) स्थायिभावः । एतत्तु चिन्त्यम्, किन्नामासौ ? तत्त्वज्ञानोत्थितो निर्वेद इति केचित् । तथा हि—दारिद्र्यादिप्रभवो यो निर्वेदः ततोऽन्य एव, हेतोस्तत्त्वज्ञानस्य वैलक्षण्यात् । स्थायिसञ्चारिमध्ये च एतदर्थमेवायं पठितः, अन्यथा माङ्गलिको मुनिः तथा न पठेत् ।" *ibid.* p. 334.

The problem that has to be faced first is the postulation of S'ānta as a Rasa. The first objection against it is that Bharata has not given its Sthāyin. To answer this criticism, certain advocates of S'ānta say that Bharata has given the Sthāyin of S'ānta in his text; it is Nirveda. But how did these advocates of S'ānta discover that it was Nirveda? Bharata does not say so; Bharata gives it as a Vyabhicāribhāva, the first among them. The reply is that Bharata's mention of Nirveda at the head of the Vyabhicārins and immediately after the Sthāyins, has a meaning. Nirveda is a dislike for objects and as such, is inauspicious, Amaṅgala. Sage Bharata is one who utters auspiciously and so his mention of Nirveda as the first asks us to explore a hidden meaning (अमङ्गलं सत् ज्ञापयति). It is to show to us that, though it is inauspicious, it is given as the first, since, while being a

Vyabhicārin, it is also a Sthāyin; the Sthāyin of the Rasa called S'ānta. If it is not for the suggestion of this Prayojana, Bharata would not have given the inauspicious Nirveda first. Then arises the question: Is Nirveda itself the Sthāyin? Nirveda is born of broken love, poverty or many more causes. What variety of it is exactly the Sthāyin of Sānta? Bharata describes Nirveda thus in Ch. 7:

तत्र **निर्वेदो** नाम दारिद्र्यव्याध्यवमानाधिक्षेपाक्रुष्टक्रोधताडन-इष्टजनवियोगतत्त्वज्ञानादिभिः विभावैः उत्पद्यते । Gaek. Edn., I, p. 357.

Bharata here gives many causes as producing Nirveda. One of these varieties of Nirveda is that born of Tattvajñāna. It is Nirveda for all mundane things. This Nirveda alone is relevant in a consideration of the S'ānta Rasa. It is this Nirveda born of Tattvajñāna that is held as the Sthāyin of S'ānta by those who are anxious to have the authority of Bharata. But how can a Vyabhicārin become a Sthāyin? It is said that only such Nirveda as is born of broken love, poverty, etc. is Vyabhicārin. The same Nirveda when it is born of Tattvajñāna and shuns all mundane things becomes the permanent Sthāyin. Says S'ārṅgadeva

स्थायी स्याद्विषयेष्वेव तत्त्वज्ञानोद्भवो यदि ।
इष्टानिष्टवियोगाप्तिकृतस्तु व्यभिचार्यसौ ॥ Saṅgītaratnākara.

Such Nirveda becomes greater not only than other kinds of Nirveda but also than all the other Sthāyins and Vyabhicārins, all of which it subordinates. Says Abhinava while expounding the case of Nirveda:

तत्त्वज्ञानजश्च निर्वेदः स्थाय्यन्तरोपमर्दकः । भाववैचित्र्यसहिष्णुभ्यो रत्यादिभ्यः यः परमः स्थायिशीलः स एव हि स्थाय्यन्तराणामुपमर्दकः ।
Gaek. Edn., I, p. 334.

It is this 'Anyopamardaka' Sthāyin-type of Nirveda that is taken.

Mammaṭa accepts Nirveda as the Sthāyin.

"निर्वेदस्य अमङ्गलप्रायस्य प्रथममनुपादेयत्वेऽपि उपादानं व्यभिचारित्वेऽपि स्थायित्वाभिधानार्थम् । तेन—

निर्वेदस्थायिभावाख्यः शान्तोऽपि नवमो रसः ।"

Mammaṭa does not say that this Nirveda is Amaṅgala, but says it is 'Amaṅgalaprāya'. As a matter of fact, Nirveda born of Tattvajñāna is the greatest Maṅgala. Says Bhaṭṭa Gopāla in his gloss here:

"तत्त्वचिन्तायां तु निर्वेदस्य न किञ्चिदमङ्गलप्रायत्वम्, प्रत्युत मङ्गलप्रायत्वमित्याह ।" T. S. S. Edn. K. Pra., p. 138.

This shows how trivial this argument for S'ānta based on Maṅgalavāda is. Another difficulty in this argument of 'Maṅgala-Amaṅgala' is the question why there should be any Maṅgala when the enumeration of the Vyabhicārins begins. No doubt, there is the habit of Madhya-maṅgala among writers, but why should that Madhya-maṅgala be at the beginning of the Vyabhicārins? Another argument advanced by the advocates of Nirveda is that it is in the position of a lamp on the door-step, a Dehalīdīpa, shedding light on either side of the door. Being enumerated at the end of the eight Sthāyins and at the beginning of the Vyabhicārins, it has to be taken, according to the implied idea of Bhārata, that Nirveda among the Vyabhicārins must once be taken with preceding items, the Sthāyins, and then with the succeeding items, the Vyabhicārins. This is also an argument without weight. For there are other Vyabhicārins which also are Sthāyins, as for instance, Amarṣa which as Krodha is the Sthāyin of Raudra, and Viṣāda which

as S'oka is the Sthāyin of Karuṇa. These are not brought to the front and enumerated at the beginning along with Nirveda.

Another possible objection to having Nirveda as Sthāyin also besides a Vyabhicārin is that a Bhāva which Bharata has

Abhinava critcises this view. He does not accept the Nirveda born of Tattvajñāna as the Sthāyin of S'ānta. If such Nirveda as is born of Tattvajñāna is the Sthāyin, it means that Tattvajñāna is the Vibhāva. The other Vibhāvas

as S'oka is the Sthāyin of Karuṇa. These are not brought to the front and enumerated at the beginning along with Nirveda.

Another possible objection to having Nirveda as Sthāyin also besides a Vyabhicārin is that a Bhāva which Bharata has definitely mentioned as a Vyabhicārin cannot be taken as a Sthāyin also. But to this the reply comes out that Bharata himself gives a hint, taking which it can be proved that the status of Sthāyitva, Vyabhicāritva and Sāttvikatva of the forty-nine Bhāvas are not names belonging only to those given under those names but that any of the forty-nine may, according to the circumstance, become any of the three. This is the pre-Abhinvagupta view of the nature of the forty-nine Bhāvas and the names Sthāyin, Vyabhicārin and Sāttvika. As a consequence of this view, there grew a tendency which expressed itself from the times of Rudraṭa and Lollaṭa up to the time of Bhoja, that Rasas are not eight or nine only, but forty-nine. The hint mentioned above and referred to by these theorists is contained in Bharata's text on the Vyabhicārins of Rati where he mentions Jugupsā, a Sthāyin, as one of the prohibited.

व्यभिचारिणश्चास्य आलस्यौग्रचजुगुप्सावर्जाः ।

Gaek. Edn., I, p. 307.

This means that Bharata himself suggests that Sthāyins may become Vyabhicārins and Vyabhicārins, Sthāyins. This view is stated as follows by Abhinava, as Pūrvapakṣa :

जुगुप्सां च व्यभिचारित्वेन शृङ्गारे निषेधन्मुनिः भावानां सर्वेषामेव स्थायित्वसञ्चारित्वचिन्तनात्तावत्त्व (चित्तजत्व)[1] अनुभावत्वानि योग्यतोपनिपतितानि शब्दार्थबलाकृष्टानि अनुजानाति । Abhi. Bhā., p. 334.

[1] Means Sāttvikatva.

Abhinava critcises this view. He does not accept the Nirveda born of Tattvajñāna as the Sthāyin of S'ānta. If such Nirveda as is born of Tattvajñāna is the Sthāyin, it means that Tattvajñāna is the Vibhāva. The other Vibhāvas given, namely Vairāgya, Samādhi, etc., are not Vibhāvas strictly. If they are included as Vibhāvas because they are causes producing Tattvajñāna, they are really the causes of the cause. The cause of the cause is never called Vibhāva. Further, Nirveda itself is an aversion towards all objects and is not different from Vairāgya. Far from being the product of Tattvajñāna, Nirveda is one of the causes bringing about Tattvajñāna. For it is one having aversion to mundane things that strives after Mokṣa and attains Tattvajñāna. It is well-known that Mokṣa is directly attained through Tattvajñāna and it is not true to say that one attains Tattvajñāna first, then gets aversion and then attains Mokṣa. Īs'varakṛṣṇa also says that Vairāgya is not the final stage preceding Mokṣa, that Vairāgya at best results only in Prakṛti-laya in the absence of Tattvajñāna. Tattvajñāna alone results in Mokṣa.

'वैराग्यात् प्रकृतिलयः ।' Sāṁ. Kārikā, 45.

Says the Vṛtti of Gauḍapāda here:

यथा कस्यचिद् वैराग्यमस्ति, न तत्त्वज्ञानम्, तस्मादज्ञानपूर्वाद्वैराग्यात् प्रकृतिलयः । मृतः अष्टासु प्रकृतिषु प्रधानबुद्ध्यहङ्कारतन्मात्रेषु लीयते, न मोक्षः ॥

It may be said that Tattvajñāna strengthens Vairāgya and increases it. Patañjali also says that Vairāgya towards Guṇas results from Tattvajñāna (Puruṣakhyāti). Yoga Sūtra I, 16: तत्परं पुरुषख्यातेर्गुणवैतृष्ण्यम्. But Vyāsa, in his Bhāṣya

on this Sūtra, says that such Vairāgya is really Jñāna: ज्ञानस्यैव परा काष्ठा वैराग्यम्. (Ānandās'rama Edn., p. 20.) Therefore it comes to Tattvajñāna strengthening and increasing itself from stage to stage. The result is there is no Nirveda as Sthāyin but only Tattvajñāna. It is the Sthāyin of S'ānta.

Surely Bharata speaks in Ch. 7 (the Bhāvādhyāya), while describing Nirveda, of the Niveda that is born of Tattvajñāna. This Tattvajñāna or Samyagjñāna and the Nirveda born of it do not refer to S'ānta Rasa and its Sthāyin but refer only to the ordinary and common Nirveda born on one realising that he has wasted his energies in a worthless cause through mistake, as in serving a miser who would not pay. वृथा दुग्धोऽनड्वान् etc. Such Nirveda can be a Bhāva only.

The advocate of Nirveda quotes now Akṣapāda against Patañjali. Akṣapāda, he states, says in his Nyāya Sūtra 1, i, 2 that the removal of Mithyājñāna, *i.e.* the appearance of Tattvajñāna, produces the destruction of Doṣa, *i.e.* produces Vairāgya. Thus Tattvajñāna-ja Nirveda or Tattvajñāna-ja Vairāgya is the Sthāyin. This Nirveda or Vairāgya is the final stage and not Tattvajñāna which is only one of the causes of Vairāgya. The reply to this is thus given in the Abhinavabhāratī: Surely Akṣapāda speaks of Vairāgya but who said Vairāgya is Nirveda? Nirveda is an attitude of aversion and a continued sadness and as such, is hardly identical with Vairāgya. Mokṣa, for which we are now postulating the Rasa (the S'ānta), is a state of Kaivalya in which there is neither the sorrow nor the joy of this earth. Vairāgya is the cessation of Rāga and Dveṣa and is not identical with Nirveda. Even if we accept that Nirveda is Vairāgya, it does not follow from Gautama's words that Vairāgya or Nirveda is the Sthāyin of S'ānta. According to the Sūtra of Gautama,

दु:खजन्मप्रवृत्तिदोषमिथ्याज्ञानानामुत्तरोत्तरापाये तदनन्तरापायादपवर्ग:,

it is not the immediately preceding condition of Mukti. From Vairāgya, activity (Pravṛtti) must stop; from cessation of activity, birth must stop and when birth ends, misery flies away; when misery has fled, it is Mukti.

Lastly, there is no good reason why one should take so much trouble, qualify it as Nirveda born of Tattvajñāna and call it Vairāgya and stick to Nirveda. Such a cumbrous and elaborately described Nirveda is only another name for the simple S'ama which can be the Sthāyin of S'ānta.

8. Utsāha.

Other views on the Sthāyin of S'ānta are also available in the Abhinavabhāratī. Certain writers held *Utsāha*, the Sthāyin of Vīra, as the Sthāyin of S'ānta also. Abhinava says:

'उत्साह एवास्य स्थायीत्यन्ये ।' p. 269.[1]

How did some writers come to hold Utsāha as the Sthāyin of S'ānta? Utsāha, as given by Bharata, is the Sthāyin of Vīra. It is said that there are three or four varieties of Vīra, Dānavīra and Dayāvīra being two of them. The variety named Dayāvīra as exhibited in the acts of sacrifice of Bodhisattvas and as dramatised by Harṣa in his Nāgānanda is very much akin to S'ānta. So much so that some antagonists of S'ānta say that there is no need for a ninth Rasa named S'ānta and that the situations in discussion come under Dayāvīra.

[1] तत्र शान्तस्य स्थायी 'विस्मयशमा' इति कैश्चित् पठित:। उत्साह एवास्य स्थायीत्यन्ये । जुगुप्सेति केचित् । सर्व इत्येके । तत्त्वज्ञानजो निर्वेदोऽस्य स्थायी . . . इत्यपरे ।" Abhi. Bhā., Gaek. Edn., I, pp. 267-270.

जुगुप्सां स्थायिभावं तु शान्ते केचिद्बभाषिरे । उत्साहमाहुरन्येऽन्ये शमम्, सर्वान् परे विदु: । . . . . . निर्वेदस्तत्त्वबोधोत्थ: स्थायी शान्ते भवेदसौ ॥

S'ārṅgadeva, Saṅgītaratnākara.

Nāgānanda is a Dayāvīra play. The Sthāyin of Dayāvīra, as of other Vīras, is Utsāha.[1] Further, the path to attain Mokṣa is one of strenuous effort and the yogin's fights and victories in the realm of the spirit have always been described in the image of heroism. (*Cf.* the description of Aja and Raghu in Canto VIII of the Raghuvaṁs'a (S'ls. 19-23; from अनयत् प्रभुशक्तिसंपदा to इति शत्रुषु चेन्द्रियेषु च.) Subrahmaṇya Sudhīḥ explains at length in his commentary, the Prauḍhaprakās'a, on the Prabodha Candrodaya (Madras MS.), how S'āntarasa is portrayed in the play in the Samāsokti of Vīra. So it is perhaps that certain advocates of S'ānta who were worried about finding a Sthāyin for S'ānta from among the Bhāvas mentioned by Bharata, chose Utsāha. They intended to improve upon the position of those who held to Nirveda, who made the mistake of voting a Vyabhicārin to a Sthāyin's place and hence felt their position beset with many difficulties.

[1] In reply to these critics of S'ānta who hold that there is no need for a new Rasa like S'ānta when there is Dayāvīra, Abhinava says that Bharata gave only three varieties of Vīra, Dānavīra, Dharmavīra and Yuddhavīra and that one cannot create a new Vīra. Dayāvīra is only a new name for S'ānta.

"नन्वेवं दयावीरो धर्मवीरो दानवीरो वा नासौ कश्चित्। शान्तस्यैवेदं नामान्तरकरणम्। तथा च मुनिः—

'दानवीरं धर्मवीरं युद्धवीरं तथैव च।
रसं वीरमपि प्राह ब्रह्मा त्रिविधसंमितम्॥'

इत्यागमपुरस्सरं त्रैविध्यमेवाभ्यधात्।" Locana, pp. 117-8.

Bhaṭṭa Gopāla, in his Kāvya Prakās'a-vyākhyā: pp. 139-140, T. S. S:

"दयावीर इति शान्तस्यैव नामान्तरकरणम्, येन 'दानवीरं युद्धवीरं धर्मवीरं तथैव च। रसं वीरमपि प्राह ब्रह्मा त्रिविधसंमितम्॥' इति त्रैविध्यमेवास्य मुनिना वीरस्याभ्यधायि॥"

They had to resort to quibbling with auspiciousness-inauspiciousness, Dehalīdīpanyāya, etc. The sponsors of Utsāha, like those of Rati and Jugupsā to whom we shall come presently, had the advantage of fixing one of the eight Sthāyins themselves mentioned by Bharata as the Sthāyin of S'ānta also. But then arose the problem: how could one Bhāva beget two Rasas? The difficulty was overcome by accepting varieties of the same Sthāyin. It was even as Nirveda being made into a special species called Tattvajñāna-ja Nirveda, Nirveda born of the knowledge of Truth. Hāsa also has many varieties. Rati is divided into Sambhoga and Vipralambha.

The writers who held Utsāha as the Sthāyin of S'ānta built on sand. They knew not what they were doing. The opponents at once undermined them by suggesting the inclusion of S'ānta in Vīra. One of the main Pūrvapakṣas to S'ānta is the possibility of its inclusion in one of the eight Rasas mentioned by Bharata. Ānanda mentions this objection and replies:

"न तस्य वीरेऽन्तर्भावः कर्तुं युक्तः। तस्य अभिमानमयत्वेन व्यवस्थापनात्। अस्य च अहङ्कारप्रशमैकरूपतया स्थितेः etc."

"तयोश्च एवंविधविशेषसद्भावेऽपि यद्यैक्यं परिकल्प्यते, तद्वीररौद्रयोरपि तथा प्रसङ्गः।" Dhva. Ā., pp. 177-8.

The Das'arūpakāvaloka says:

"अन्ये तु वीरबीभत्सादौ अन्तर्भावं वर्णयन्ति।"

The real position of the Bhāva called Utsāha is this: Utsāha closely attends upon Ahaṅkāra without which there cannot be any activity. No Rasa is possible without these two elements. Bhoja pursues this line and discovers his

Ahaṅkāra theory of Rasa. But according to the rule of pre-

learning their true import and propagation of their teachings

Ahaṅkāra theory of Rasa. But according to the rule of predominance, Prādhānyanyāya, it is Vīrarasa to which this Utsāha is connected most. This Vīra is held to have four varieties, Yuddha, Dharma, Dāna and Dayā Vīras. Of this Yuddhavīra is Vīra proper. Utsāha is however Sthāyin of the other three varieties also. This Utsāha is the very basis of all action and as such can be seen in some varieties of S'ānta. Two such varieties are Dayāvīra and Dharmavīra which are really names of two aspects of S'ānta. S'ānta is a wider field; it includes Dayā and Dharma but is not included in or exhausted by these two. Numerous are the religions and paths of action towards spiritual realisation. Why these two Vīras of Dayā and Dharma only? Dānavīra can be a form of S'ānta. Dāna may stand for Tyāga also. त्यागेनैके अमृतत्वमानशुः. Even Yuddhavīra can be a form of S'ānta: there are those who fight religious crusades for the defence of their faith. Similarly there can be a variety of S'ānta called Pāṇḍityavīra which Jagannātha humorously introduces.[1] Study of texts,

[1] Rasagaṅgādhara, K. M. edn., pp. 37-42. वस्तुतस्तु बह्वो वीररसस्य शृङ्गारस्येव प्रकारा निरूपयितुं शक्यन्ते. (p. 51.) Jagannātha mentions besides the four old Vīras, Satyavīra, Pāṇḍityavīra, Kṣamāvīra and Balavīra. The Mahābhārata mentions numberless varieties of this Vīra, while describing Dāna. Bhīṣma says in the Dānadharmaparvan in the Anus'āsana, S'ls. 22-27.

शूरा बहुविधाः प्रोक्ताः तेषामर्थांस्तु मे शृणु ।

. . .

यज्ञशूरा दमे शूराः सत्यशूरास्तथापरे ।
युद्धशूरास्तथैवोक्ता दानशूराश्च मानवाः ॥
बुद्धिशूरास्तथैवान्ये क्षमाशूरास्तथा परे ।
सांख्यशूराश्च बह्वो योगशूरास्तथा परे ॥
अरण्ये गृहवासे च त्यागे शूरास्तथा परे ।
आर्जवे च तथा शूराः शमे वर्तन्ति मानवाः ॥

learning their true import and propagation of their teachings form part of S'ānta-activities. These produce Pāṇḍityavīra in the prophet who has to meet and win adversaries in debate. So also there is Kṣamāvīra which also Jagannātha points out. Kṣamā is a virtue of very great importance in S'ānta. So Utsāha is not S'ānta; S'ānta comprehends many kinds of Utsāha. That is, several kinds of sublimating Utsāhas are Vyabhicārins in S'ānta. Dayā-Utsāha, Dāna-Utsāha, etc. are very frequent and are intimately related Vyabhicārins in S'ānta. Even the yogin who has realised Truth and has become, like God, Kṛtakṛtya and Avāptasamāstakāma, has yet embodied existence in this world as Jīvanmukta and naturally, like God, he also stops not from untainting action for the sake of the world. The Lord says:

न मे पार्थास्ति कर्तव्यं त्रिषु लोकेषु किञ्चन ।
नानवाप्तमवाप्तव्यं वर्त एव च कर्मणि ॥ etc. Bha. Gītā, III, 22-24.

Thus Utsāha of such selfless activities as in Dānavīra, Dayāvīra, Dharmavīra, etc. is an intimate accessory (and only an accessory) in S'ānta. Says Abhinava:

"स्वात्मनि च कृतकृत्यस्य परार्थघटनायामेव उद्यम इति उत्साहोऽस्य परोपकारविषयेच्छाप्रयत्नरूपो दयापरपर्यायः **अभ्यधिको**ऽन्तरङ्गः। अत एव तत् केचित् दयावीरत्वेन व्यपदिशन्ति, अन्ये धर्मवीरत्वेन ।"

Abhi. Bhā., Gaek. Edn., I, p. 338.

तैस्तैश्च नियमैश्शूरा बहवः सन्ति चापरे ।
वेदाध्ययनशूराश्च शूराश्चाध्यापने रताः ॥
गुरुशुश्रूषया शूराः पितृशुश्रूषया परे ।
मातृशुश्रूषया शूरा भैक्ष्यशूरास्तथा परे ॥
अरण्ये गृहवासे च शूराश्चातिथिपूजने ।
सर्वे यान्ति परान् लोकान् स्वकर्मफलनिर्जितान् ॥ Kumbakonam Edn.

There is a saying that for those who would have this world, there is no hope for the other. Only he who discards all mundane things can walk to salvation. For this, he must cultivate the feeling of disgust or loathsomeness towards the things of this world. This is the Bhāva of Jugupsā. Some hold this to be most important in S'ānta and propose it for the place of the Sthāyin.[1] 'जुगुप्सेति केचित्' Abhi. Bhā., Gaek. Edn., I, p. 262.

9. Jugupsā.

Bhaṭṭa Tauta has made some contribution to this Jugupsā and its relation to S'ānta. In S'ls. 97-102, Ch. VI, Bharata speaks of the varieties in each of the eight Rasas and here he says of Bībhatsa :

बीभत्सः क्षोभणः शुद्ध उद्वेगी स्यात् द्वितीयकः ।
विष्ठाक्रुमिभिरुद्वेगी क्षोभणो रुधिरादिजः ॥ 101.

Bībhatsa is of two kinds, Kṣobhaṇa and Udvegī. But in the first line, there is an additional word *S'uddha.* Commentators took it as qualifying Kṣobhaṇa and they distinguished the Udvegī variety as As'uddha. But Bhaṭṭa Tauta said that Bībhatsa is of three kinds: Kṣobhaṇa, S'uddha and Udvegī. The Gaek. Edn. gives a reading here which has 'स्यात्तृतीयकः' for 'स्यात् द्वितीयकः'. Tauta explains S'uddha Jugupsā as the disgust at the so-called pleasures of the world. Such Jugupsā is illustrated by poems of Vairāgya in which women and the like are denounced. This is a very powerful aid to Mokṣa.[2] When passions assail and evils tempt, Patañjali asks us to contemplate the other side of the pleasures, the attendant misery, etc., and begin to loathe them.

[1] Nirveda is very closely allied to this Jugupsā.

[2] Just as Nirveda which is born of Tattvajñāna becomes Maṅgala, Jugupsā for worldly objects become S'uddha.

"रुधिरान्त्रादिदर्शनाद्यो बीभत्सः (स) क्षोभणत्वाच्छुद्धः । यस्तु विष्ठादिभ्यः स उद्वेगी हृदयं चलयति, सोऽशुद्धः, अशुद्धविभावकत्वात् ।

उपाध्यायस्त्वाह—बीभत्सस्तावत् विभावविशेषात् यत्र तु संसार-नाट्यनायकरागप्रतिपक्षतया मोक्षसाधनत्वात् शुद्धः, यदाहुः—'शौचात् स्वाङ्गजुगुप्सा' योगसू॰ II. 40.) इति । तथा 'वितर्कबाधने प्रतिपक्ष-भावनम्' इति (योगसू॰ II. 33.) । तेन सोऽपि (बीभत्सोऽपि) परमार्थत-स्त्रिविध एव ।" Abhi. Bhā., Gaek. Edn., I, p. 332.

But Tauta did not have the reading 'स्यात् तृतीयकः' for he interprets the text 'स्याद् द्वितीयकः'. He says that though there are really three kinds, Bharata speaks of two, because of the rarity of persons having the S'uddha Jugupsā.

"द्वितीयक इत्यनेन तस्य दुर्लभत्वेव अप्राचुर्यं सूचयति ।"
ibid. P. 332.

So it is that some critics who do not want a separate S'ānta say that, even as it is possible to include it in Vīra, it is possible to include it in Bībhatsa. The D. R. Avaloka says:

"अन्ये तु वीरबीभत्सादौ अन्तर्भावं वर्णयन्ति ।"

The reply to this is the same as to the argument which sought to include S'ānta in Vīra. Just as Utsāha is a very prominent accessory of S'ānta, Jugupsā also is. This S'uddha Jugupsā may be a prominent Vyabhicārin; but S'ānta is not Jugupsātmaka. The Locana says:

"आदिग्रहणेन विषयजुगुप्सारूपत्वात् बीभत्सेऽन्तर्भावः शक्यते । सा त्वस्य व्यभिचारिणी भवति, न तु स्थायितामेति ।" P. 178.

The Abhinavabhāratī says:

"केवलं यथा विप्रलम्भे औत्सुक्यम्, सम्भोगेऽपि वा 'प्रेमासमाप्तोत्सवम्' इति, यथा च रौद्रे औग्र्यम्, यथा च करुणवीरभयानकाद्भुतेषु निर्वेदधृतित्रासहर्षाः व्यभिचारिणोऽपि प्राधान्येनावभासन्ते तथा शान्ते जुगुप्साद्याः, सर्वथैव रागप्रतिपक्षत्वात् ।" p. 338.

10. Rati.

Another interesting view is that which holds the first Sthāyin, Rati, itself as the Sthāyin of Sānta Rasa. This view also arose out of the necessity to choose one of the Sthāyins mentioned by Bharata himself as the Sthāyin of S'ānta also. This view also makes a fine approach to S'ānta and is an appreciation of an aspect of the fundamental nature of S'ānta. Truth whose realisation is salvation is of the nature of Self which is Ātman. It has to be realised by piercing the veil of things which are 'Anātman' and which shroud the Ātman. Things Anātman must be loathed and this loathing of Anātman led to the Jugupsā-view. The Rati-view is closely related to the Jugupsā-view; for when 'Anātman' is *loathed*, Ātman has to be *loved*. This love of Ātman, Ātmarati, is the Sthāyin of S'ānta. When one realises Ātman everywhere, his Love floods the universe; Jugupsā then flies away; for there is none besides or beyond Ātman to be shunned then.

यस्तु सर्वाणि भूतानि आत्मन्येवानुपश्यति ।
सर्वभूतेषु चात्मानं ततो न विजुगुप्सते ॥

Like S'uddha Jugupsā, this is S'uddha Rati, a superior Love, distinct from the Rati of man for woman. Bhoja pursued this idea of Ātmarati and landed on the philosophical summit of the S'ṛṅgāra theory of one Rasa.

ज्ञेयो रसः स रसनीयतया आत्मरक्तेः । S'ṛ. Pra.

The Abhinavabhāratī records the Rati-view thus:

तत्र अनाहतानन्दमयस्वात्मविषया रतिरेव मोक्षसाधनमिति सैव शान्ते स्थायिनीति । यथोक्तम्—

'यश्चात्मरतिरेव स्यादात्मतृप्तश्च मानवः ।
आत्मन्येव च सन्तुष्टः तस्य कार्यं न विद्यते ॥' इति (भ. गीता.)

Abhi. Bhā., Gaek. Edn., I, p. 335.

Further, Rati has this additional qualification for being the Sthāyin of S'ānta, since the final state of Mokṣa is one of Ānanda and Self which is realised is itself of the form of Ānanda.

This Rati sails in the same boat as Utsāha and Jugupsā. Only it seems to be more intimate to S'ānta, a Vyabhicārin of greater importance. Not only Ātma-rati, but Rati for a personal God, which is called Bhakti and is proposed as a separate Rasa, comes under S'ānta. The S'ānta has had a love-treatment at the hands of some poets and theorists.

'अत एव ईश्वरप्रणिधानविषये भक्तिश्रद्धे स्मृतिमतिधृत्युत्साहानुप्रविष्टे अन्यथैवाङ्गमिति न तयोः पृथग्रसत्वेन गणनम् ।'

Abhi. Bhā., Gaek. Edn., I, p. 340.

11. Any one of the remaining Sthāyins.

On the same grounds on which Utsāha, Jugupsā and Rati were proposed, the other Sthāyins can also be proposed as Sthāyins of S'ānta. Only they have to be shorn of their ordinary Vibhāvas, etc. and made a superior and extra-ordinary variety (*Vicitra*) with Vibhāvas like S'ruta, etc. Any one of these eight *Vicitra* Sthāyins can be called the Sthāyin of S'ānta. Abhinava says:

"अन्ये मन्यन्ते रत्यादय एवाष्टौ चित्तवृत्तिविशेषा उक्ताः । त एव कथितविभावविविक्त(तया) श्रुताद्यलौकिकविभावविशेषसंश्रयाः विचित्रा एव तावत । ततश्च तन्मध्याद् एव अन्यतमोऽत्र स्थायी ।"

It is in accordance with this view that some hold a variety of Vīra, Dayā or Dharma, Jugupsa for the world called S'uddha Jugupsā and Rati towards the Self called Ātma Rati as the Sthāyins of S'ānta. Abhinava elaborates in his Pūrvapakṣa that others among the eight Sthāyins have equal claim to be the Sthāyin.

"एवं समस्तविषयं **वैकृतं**[1] पश्यतः, विश्वं च **शोच्यं**[2] विलोकयतः, सांसारिकं च वृत्तम् **अपकारित्वेन**[3] पश्यतः, सातिशयम् असंमोहप्रधानं **वीर्य**[4]माश्रितवतः, सर्वस्मात् विषयसार्थाद् **बिभ्यतः**,[5] सर्वलोकस्पृहणीयादपि प्रमदादेः **जुगुप्समानस्य**,[6] अपूर्वस्वात्मातिशयलाभात् **विस्मयमानस्य**,[7] मोक्षसिद्धिरिति हासादीनां विस्मयान्तानां स्थायित्वं निरूपणीयम् । न चैतन्मुनेः न संमतम् । यावदेव हि विशिष्टान् विभावान् परिगणयति रत्यादिशब्देन चशब्देन च तत्प्रकारानेन अन्यान् गृह्णीते, तावदेव तद्व्यतिरिक्त-अलौकिकहेतूपनतानां रत्यादीनामनुजानात्येव अपवर्गविषयत्वम् ।

एवंवादिनां तु परस्परमेव विशारयतां एकस्य स्थायित्वं विशीर्यत एव । तदुपायभेदात्तस्य तस्य स्थायित्वमित्यप्युच्यमानं प्रत्युक्तमेव । स्थायिभेदेन प्रतिपुरुषं रसस्याप्यानन्त्यापत्तेः । मोक्षैकफलत्वादेको रस इति चेत्, क्षयैकफलत्वे वीररौद्रयोरप्येकत्वं स्यात् ।"

Gaek. Edn., I, pp. 336-7 (Corrected).

It is often said that for the thinking man, the world is a comedy. Man's pursuit after trifles, his अस्थाने महत्त्वसम्भावना,

[1] Hāsa.
[2] S'oka.
[3] Krodha.
[4] Utsāha.
[5] Bhaya.
[6] Jugupsā.
[7] Vismaya.

produces laughter in those who know the real value of the things of the world. To the Yogin, man's action and sentiment appear as Karma-ābhāsa and Bhāva-ābhāsa. Says Bhaṭṭa Bhallaṭa in a fine verse :

एतत्तस्य मुखात् कियत् कमलिनीपत्रे कणं पाथसः
यन्मुक्तामणिरित्यमंस्त स जडः शृण्वेतदस्मादपि ।
अङ्गुल्यग्रनखक्रियाप्रविलयिन्यादीयमाने शनैः
कुत्रोड्डीय गतो हहेत्यनुदिनं निद्राति नान्तःशुचा ॥

So much on behalf of the importance of Hāsa in S'ānta.

It is but a thin line that divides comedy from tragedy. To the feeling man, the same world is a tragedy. The Yogin pities the poor Samsārin, caught in the whirlpool of passion. Thus S'oka seems to dominate in S'ānta. The seeking Yogin, the Yatamāna, who strives towards his goal, considers the world and its temptations as his enemy ; he gets angry at them and desires to do away with them. This attitude is Krodha and Raudra. The same attitude begets fear of the temptations from which the seeker desires to fly. This is Bhaya. He reads of or listens to an exposition of the greatness, the omniscience, omnipresence, blissfulness and other aspects of the nature of the Self and when he contemplates on this wonderful truth about his own Self, he is thrilled and struck with the wonders of the world of the Spirit. This is Vismaya. As explained already, he loathes even the socalled pleasures of the world and then Jugupsā forms the prominent attitude. In this manner, these seven Sthāyins can claim to be the Sthāyins of S'ānta.

The very possibility of each or all of the eight Sthāyins being the Sthāyin of S'ānta prevents any one of them being the settled Sthāyin of S'ānta. It cannot also be held that,

according to circumstances, the Sthāyin varies in S'ānta. A multi-sthāyinned Rasa is foreign to the theory of Rasa and is an impossibility. Many Sthāyins can only mean many Rasas. If by virtue of the unity of the object, *viz.*, Mokṣa, a plurality of Sthāyins is accepted as resulting only in one Rasa, it can be pointed out that in view of both Vīra and Raudra resulting in the same end of the destruction of the enemy, Vīra and Raudra can be made into one Rasa. Therefore, neither any one nor all of the eight Sthāyins can be put forward as the Sthāyin of S'ānta.

The real significance of this view however lies in another direction. It points to the fact that any or all of the other Sthāyins become, in their vicitra varieties, Vyabhicārins of S'ānta and in their ordinary varieties the causes of S'ānta. One may pass to S'āma from Rati or S'oka; as a result of broken love, or the death of a beloved person, one may seek solace in S'ama. As'oka fought the Kaliṅgas and passed from Vīra to S'ānta. Therefore any of the eight Rasas or all of them can be the Uddīpaka of S'ānta. Therefore it is that S'ārṅgadeva says: S'āma is present in all the Rasas.

शमः सर्वरसेष्वस्ति स्थैर्यत्वेऽव्यभिचार्यसौ । S'. R., VII, S'l. 3535

and Kallinātha comments upon this :

'अयमर्थः—लोके शृङ्गारादिषु अष्टसु मध्ये यं कंचन रसमनुभवत एव पुंसो जन्मान्तरसुकृतविशेषवशात् शम उत्पद्यत इति तत्तद्रससम्बन्धात् शमस्य सर्वरसेषु अस्तित्वम् इति ।'

12. All the eight Sthāyins together.

The next view is a reply to the criticism of the above-given view which proposed any one of the eight Sthāyins as the Sthāyin of S'ānta. This view suggests that all the eight can be

considered as constituting together the Sthāyin, taking S'ānta as a peculiar case.

"सर्वे इत्येके ।" Abhi. Bhā., Gaek. Edn., I, p. 269.

"अन्ये तु पानकरसवत् अविभागं प्राप्ताः सर्व एव रत्यादयोऽत्र स्थायिनः इत्याहुः । चित्तवृत्तीनामयुगपद्भावात्, अन्योन्यं च विरोधात् एतदपि न मनोज्ञम् ।" *ibid.*, p. 332.

It is true that as Pūrvapakṣa, the whole of this complex world is involved in S'ānta; but all these form only Vyabhicārins. Says Abhinava :

"तत्त्वज्ञानलक्षणस्य च स्थायिनः समस्तोऽयं लौकिकालौकिकचित्तवृत्तिकलापो व्यभिचारितामभ्येति ।" *ibid.*, p. 338.

Rasa is developed from one and only one Sthāyin; if many Bhāvas appear, they can do so only as Vyabhicārins. The analogy of Pānakarasa must not be brought here. These Bhāvas contradict each other and cannot co-exist at the same time. How could they function together to produce a common Rasa?

13. Siddhānta: Ātman, Ātmajñāna or Tattvajñāna.

So, what is the real Sthāyin of S'ānta? Abhinava holds that Tattvajñāna or Ātmasvarūpa itself is the Sthāyin of S'ānta. He briefly states it thus in his Abhinavabhāratī :

"कस्तर्ह्यत्र स्थायी? उच्यते—इह **तत्त्वज्ञानमेव** तावन्मोक्षसाधनमिति तस्यैव मोक्षे स्थायिता युक्ता । तत्त्वज्ञानं च नाम **आत्मज्ञानमेव** ।"

"तेन **आत्मैव** ज्ञानानन्दादिविशुद्धधर्मयोगी परिकल्पितविषयोपभोगरहितोऽत्र स्थायी ।" Gaek. Edn., I, p. 337.

Earlier also he says :

" ततः त्रिवर्गात्मकप्रवृत्तिधर्मविपरीतनिवृत्तिधर्मात्मको मोक्षफलः शान्तः । तत्र **स्वात्मावेशेन** रसचर्वणेत्युक्तम् ।" *ibid.* p. 269.

Tattvajñāna or knowledge of Ātman is the direct cause or is itself Mokṣa. Therefore Ātmajñāna or the very nature of the Soul or Self which is itself of the form of Knowledge and Bliss—Jñāna and Ānanda—is the Sthāyin. This Ātman is Sthāyin not in the same sense in which Rati, etc. are ; it is Sthāyin *par excellence.* It is the basis and the root of all other Sthāyins. It is upon the substratum of this ultimate Sthāyin that, as a result of sense-contacts with external objects of the world, the other eight Sthāyins are created. Behind Rati, Hāsa, etc. is the eternal Ātman. Rati and other Sthāyins rise and fall but Ātman is Sthāyitama ; Rati and the other Sthāyins become its Vyabhicārins. (Abhi. Bhā., p. 337.)

Therefore it is, says Abhinava, that Bharata mentions not this S'ānta rasa and its Sthāyin, Ātman. For, it belongs to a higher plane and it would have been improper if Bharata had given it among Rati and the rest. It is the very basis of Rati, etc. which are not possible without it. Hence there is no need to specially mention what is undeniably implied.

अत एव पृथगस्य गणना न युक्ता । Abhi. Bhā., I, p. 337.

Bhaṭṭa Gopāla adds that Bharata abstained form indicating the Vibhāvas, etc. of S'ānta, not because he did not accept this Rasa, but because of its super-mundane nature.

" विभावाद्यप्रतिपादनं तस्य परमपुरुषार्थतया लोकयात्रातिक्रान्तत्वात् "

T. S. S., Edn. K. pra. vyā, p. 139.

This answers also the objection that one should not go beyond the total number of the Bhāvas which is given by Bharata as forty-nine. Abhinava says that the sanctity of the number '49' is protected and that Bharata treats of S'ānta by omission, by his eloquent silence.

" तेन **आत्मैव** ज्ञानानन्दादिविशुद्धधर्मयोगी परिकल्पितविषयोपभोगरहितोऽत्र स्थायी । न चास्य स्थायितया स्थायित्वं वचनीयम् । रत्यादयो हि तत्तत्कारणान्तरोदयप्रलयोत्पद्यमाननिरुध्यमानवृत्तयः कञ्चित्कालम् आपेक्षिकतया स्थायिरूपात्मभित्तिसंश्रयाः स्थायिन उच्यन्ते । तत्त्वज्ञानं तु सकलभावान्तरभित्तिस्थानीयं सर्वस्थायिभ्यः स्थायितमं सर्वा रत्यादिकाः चित्तवृत्तीः व्यभिचारीभावयन् निसर्गत एव सिद्धस्थायिभावमिति तन्न वचनीयम् । अत एव पृथगस्य गणना न युक्ता । न हि खण्डमुण्डयोर्मध्ये गोत्वमिति गण्यते । तेन एकान्नपञ्चाशद्भावा इत्यव्याहतमेव ।"

Abhi. Bhā., Gaek. Edn., I, p. 337.

As the permanent wall upon which Rati, etc. are formed, Ātman, the supreme Sthāyin, is necessarily implied. This mention by silence means not only its acceptance but its acceptance as the greatest Rasa.

Another reason why Bharata has not mentioned S'ānta along with Rati, etc. is the difference between Ātmajñāna and other Sthāyins. Ātmajñāna is not relished by the same means or in the same manner as other Sthāyins. Since Ātmasvarūpa is usually seen as tinted by Rati, etc., the ordinary means of comprehension which comprehend Rati, etc. do not comprehend the Ātmasvarūpa. Further Bharata never attempted to give all the possible Sthāyins. He gave only those Sthāyins which are also Vyabhicārins ; hence it is that he clubs them all together and speaks of them as the forty-nine Bhāvas.

That Sthāyin, Ātmajñāna, which is never a Vyabhicārin anywhere, is not mentioned at all by him. How could he, knowing as he did, its real nature?

All the above-given ingenuity and strain are the unavoidable corollary of the ancient method of commenting which never desired to go against the basic text and introduced new things only by securing for it the sanction of the basic text. The facts about the Rasa of S'ānta itself which we gather from this discussion are:

1. Tattvajñāna or Ātmajñāna or Ātmasvarūpa or briefly the Ātman itself is the Sthāyin of S'ānta.

2. It is like the wall; upon it are formed Rati, etc. which are 'Upādhis' of the pure self-illumined Spirit. Nourishment of the permanent, unconditioned and untarnished Spirit by the appropriate Vibhāvas, etc. will give the S'ānta Rasa.

3. Though Rati etc. are Sthāyins compared to Nirveda etc., they are Vyabhicārins compared to the Ātmasthāyin, which is Sthāyitama.

"न चास्य आत्मस्वभावस्य व्यभिचारित्वम्, असंभवात्, अवैचित्र्यावहत्वात्, अनौचित्याच्च । शम आत्मस्वभावः ।"

This Ātmasvabhāva is called S'ama.[1]

[1] Though Abhinava holds S'ama which is identical with Ātmasvabhāva as a Sthāyin for all time, the anonymous commentary on the Vyaktiviveka holds S'ama as appearing in the form of Vyabhicārin also in S'ṛṅgāra.

"स्थायिनामपि व्यभिचारित्वं भवति । यथा रतेर्देवादिविषयायाः, हास्यस्य शृङ्गारादौ, शोकस्य विप्रलम्भशृङ्गारादौ . . . . . . शमस्य कोपाभिहतस्य प्रसादोद्गमादौ ।" T. S. S., Edn., pp. 11-12.

S'ārṅgadeva also, who closely follows Abhinava, considers S'ama as a Vyabhicārin also. Perhaps Abhinava will reply to this

Abhinava advanced the above-given arguments for S'ānta and its Sthāyin without resorting to the text of Bharata on S'ānta found in some recensions. In this text, S'ama is given as the Sthāyin of S'ānta.

अथ शान्तो नाम शमस्थायिभावात्मकः etc.

Abhinava has said that S'ama is only another name for Ātmasvabhāva. When one speaks of S'ama or Nirveda both of which are Cittavṛttis, one has to qualify them as a special and superior kind to make them the Sthāyin of S'ānta. This qualification is unnecessary when Ātman itself is accepted as the Sthāyin. Rati etc. which contaminate the Ātman represent the disturbed or Vyutthita state of the Citta. The pure nature of the Spirit is like the white thread on which are hung coloured stones at intervals. By constant meditation and effort, the pure light within is seen. It is a state of bliss in a double degree, as Rasāsvāda and as the Āsvāda of the real Ātmasvarūpa which is Ānanda.

The text on S'ānta found in some recensions describes S'ānta as the Prakṛti and Rati and other Bhāvas as its Vikāras. The latter rise and fall, appear and disappear on the Ātman. They merge in it.

न यत्र दुःखं न सुखं न द्वेषो नापि मत्सरः ।
समः सर्वेषु भूतेषु स शान्तः प्रथितो रसः ॥
भावा विकारा रत्याद्याः शान्तस्तु प्रकृतिर्मतः ।
विकारः प्रकृतेर्जातः पुनस्तत्रैव लीयते ॥

that just as there are two different Nirvedas, two different Tattvajñānas, there are two S'amas. The Nirveda illustrated by the verse तृथा दुग्धोऽनड्वान् etc. is only a Bhāva; it cannot be Tattvajñāna-ja Nirveda which alone is held by some as Sthāyin. *See* Abhi. Bhā., pp. 335-6 and 335. Similar in nature is the Vyabhicāri-S'ama.

स्वं स्वं निमित्तमासाद्य शान्ताद्भावः प्रवर्तते ।
पुनर्निमित्तापाये च शान्त एवोपलीयते ॥

Therefore it is that Bharata, says Abhinava, treated of S'ānta at the head of all the Rasas. Further the relish of all Rasas is Alaukika, shorn of all mundane associations, and hence *S'āntaprāya*. The bliss realised is akin to Brahmāsvāda which is Ātmāsvāda. Jagannātha pursued this line and said that Rasa is the manifestation of the light of Ātman itself when the obscuring element falls away. Poetry and Drama remove the bars and Ātman manifests itself.

"वस्तुतस्तु वक्ष्यमाणश्रुतिस्वारस्येन भग्नावरणा चिदेव रसः ।"

Rasagaṅgādhara, p. 23.

V

THE TEXT OF THE ABHINAVABHĀRATĪ ON THE S'ĀNTA RASA

IN this section, I am presenting the text of the Abhinavabhāratī on the S'ānta Rasa. It would have been unnecessary to give this text here, if the text available in the Gaekwad Edition had not been so error-ridden. The text presented here by me is as corrected with the help of Professor Mm. S. Kuppuswami Sastriar. I give in the foot-notes the incorrect readings found in the MS. in the Madras Government Oriental MSS. Library with the letter '*M*', and in the Gaekwad Edition with the letter '*G*'.[1] There are still a few passages of which completely satisfactory reconstruction has not been possible. Pandit H. Sesha Aiyangar of the Kanarese Department of the Madras University placed at my disposal the readings in two MSS. of the Abhinavabhāratī from Māngāv Koil, which belong to H. H. the Jīyar of Melkote. Some of the readings in these two Māngāv MSS. supported our reconstructions while many agreed with those found in the Gaek. Edition. Two of the Māngāv readings were definitely helpful and these are given, besides a few others, in the foot-notes with the letters '*A*', '*B*', '*C*'.

[1] *Vide*, Nāṭya S'āstra, Gaek. Edn., Vol. I, pp. 333-42.

It is well known that Hemacandra, who reproduces whole sections from Abhinava, helps us a good deal in the task of reconstructing the text of the Abhinavabhāratī. The S'ānta Rasa section in the Abhinavabhāratī is to be found, with the omission of some parts, on p. 68 (text and com.), pp. 80-87 (com.) and p. 96. (com.) of Hemacandra's Kāvyānus'āsana. As pointed out in the foot-notes, Hemacandra supports the two Māngāv readings selected by me, towards the close of the section.

अभिनवभारत्यां

शान्तरसप्रकरणम्

ये पुनर्नव रसा इति पठन्ति, तन्मते शान्तस्वरूपमभिधीयते । तत्र केचिदाहुः—शान्तः शम**स्थायि**भावात्मकः तपस्यायोगिसंपर्कादिभिः **विभावै**रुत्पद्यते । तस्य कामक्रोधाद्यभावरूपैरनु**भावै**रभिनयः । **व्यभिचारी** धृतिमतिप्रभृतिरिति ॥

एतदपरे न सहन्ते, शमशान्तयोः पर्यायत्वात्, एकान्नपञ्चाशद्भावा इति संख्यात्यागात् । किञ्च विभावा ऋतुमाल्यादयः तत्समनन्तरभाविनि शृङ्गारादावनुसन्धीयन्त इति युक्तम् । तपोऽध्ययनादयस्तु न शान्तस्य [1]समनन्तरहेतवः । तत्त्वज्ञानस्य [2]अनन्तरहेतव इति चेत् [3]पूर्वोदिततत्त्वज्ञानेऽपि तर्हि प्रयोज्यतेति तपोऽध्ययनादीनां विभावता [4]त्यक्ता स्यात् ।

[1] M. and G. शमनस्य ये हेतवः

[2] M. अनन्तहेतवः

[3] M. पूर्वरोदिततत्त्वज्ञानेऽपि.

[4] G. युक्ता.

[1]कामाद्यभावोऽपि नानुभावः, शान्ताद्विपक्षादव्यावृत्तेः, अगमकत्वात्, प्रयोगासमवायित्वाच्च ; न हि चेष्टाव्युपरमः प्रयोगयोग्यः । सुप्तमोहादयोऽपि हि निःश्वासोच्छ्वासपतनभूशयनादिभिः[2] चेष्टाभिरेवानुभाव्यन्ते[3] । धृतिप्रभृतिरपि प्राप्तविषयोपरागः[4] कथं शान्ते स्यात् ? न चाकिञ्चित्करत्वमात्रेण तत्त्वज्ञानोपाये व्युत्पाद्यन्ते[5] विनेयाः[6] । [7]नैते परदुःखदुःखितमनसो दृश्यन्ते[8] सम्यग्दर्शन [A]समावस्थां प्राप्ताः, अपि तु संसारे । तन्न शान्तो रस इति ॥

अत्रोच्यते—यथा[9] इह तावत् धर्मादित्रितयम्, एवं[10] मोक्षोऽपि पुरुषार्थः शास्त्रेषु स्मृतीतिहासादिषु च प्राधान्येनोपायतो व्युत्पाद्यत इति सुप्रसिद्धम् । यथा च कामादिषु समुचिताश्चित्तवृत्तयो रत्यादिशब्दवाच्याः कविनटव्यापारेण आस्वादयोग्यताप्रापणद्वारेण तथाविधहृदयसंवादवतः सामाजिकान् प्रति रसत्वं शृङ्गारादितया नीयन्ते, तथा मोक्षाभिधानपरमपुरुषार्थोचिता चित्तवृत्तिः किमिति रसत्वं[11] नानीयत इति वक्तव्यम् । या चासौ तथाभूता चित्तवृत्तिः सैवात्र **स्थायिभावः**। एतत्तु चिन्त्यम्—किन्ना-

[1] M. कामाद्यनुभावः

[2] M. भूषणादिभिः

[3] M. अनुभाव्यते.

[4] M. and G. प्राप्तविषयोपभोगः

[5] G. तत्त्वज्ञानोपायः व्युत्पाद्यते.

[6] G. विनेये.

[7] G. चैते.

[8] G. मानसो दृश्यते.

[A] शमावस्थां is the reading in both the Māngāv MSS.

[9] यथा is omitted in M.

[10] M. एव.

[11] M. रसत्वान.

मासौ? **तत्त्वज्ञानोत्थितो निर्वेद** इति केचित् । तथा हि—दारिद्र्यादिप्रभवो यो निर्वेदः ततोऽन्य एव, हेतोस्तत्त्वज्ञानस्य वैलक्षण्यात् । स्थायिसञ्चारिमध्ये चैतदर्थमेवायं पठितः[1], अन्यथा माङ्गलिको मुनिः तथा न पठेत् । जुगुप्सां च व्यभिचारित्वेन शृङ्गारे निषेधन्[2] मुनिर्भावानां सर्वेषामेव स्थायित्वसञ्चारित्वचित्ततत्ताजत्व[3] अनुभावत्वानि[4] योग्यतोपनिपतितानि शब्दार्थबलाकृष्टानि [5]अनुजानाति । तत्त्वज्ञानजश्च निर्वेदः स्थाय्यन्तरोपमर्दकः[6] । भाववैचित्र्यसहिष्णुभ्यो रत्यादिभ्यो यः परमः[7] स्थायिशीलः, स एव किल स्थाय्यन्तराणामुपमर्दकः ॥

इदमपि पर्यनुयुञ्जते—तत्त्वज्ञानजो निर्वेदोऽस्य[8] स्थायीति वदता तत्त्वज्ञानमेवात्र विभावत्वेन उक्तं स्यात् । वैराग्यसबीजादिषु[9] कथं विभावत्वम्? तदुपायादिति चेत् कारणकारणेऽयं विभावताव्यवहारः, स चातिप्रसङ्गावहः । किञ्च निर्वेदो नाम सर्वत्रानुपादेयताप्रत्ययो वैराग्यलक्षणः, स च तत्त्वज्ञानस्य प्रत्युतोपयोगी । विरक्तो हि तथा प्रयतते, यथास्य तत्त्व-

[1] M. परितः

[2] M. निषेधम्.

[3] M. reads चिन्ततात्तापत्व and G. चिन्तनात् तावत्व. Both mean little. We must have a word here to mean सात्त्विकत्व. All writers from Bharata explain Sattva as Manas and therefore चित्ततत्ताजत्व, however much uncouth the word may be, is suggested as standing here to mean सात्त्विकभाव. Unfortunately, Hemacandra's epitome of this passage (p. 68, com.) does not have this word.

[4] M. and G.—अनुभावस्थत्वात् नियोग्यतोपनिपतिता निःशब्दबलाकृष्टा.

[5] G. वा नानुजाति; M. ननु जानाति.

[6] M. उपमर्दकभाव etc.

[7] M. and G. परमस्थायिशीलः

[8] M. and G. व्यवस्थायीति.

[9] G. and Hemacandra. वैराग्यबीजादिषु.

ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते; तत्त्वज्ञानाद्धि मोक्षः, न तु तत्त्वं ज्ञात्वा निर्विद्यते, निर्वेदाच्च मोक्ष इति । 'वैराग्यात् प्रकृतिलयः' (ई. कृ. साङ्ख्यकारिका—४५) इति हि तत्रभवन्तः । ननु तत्त्वज्ञानिनः सर्वत्र दृढतरं वैराग्यं दृष्टम् । तत्रभवद्भिरप्युक्तम्—'तत्परं पुरुषख्यातेर्गुणवैतृष्ण्यम्' (योगसूत्रम्—१.१३) इति भवत्येवम्; 'तादृशं तु वैराग्यं ज्ञानस्यैव परा काष्ठा' इति भुजङ्गविभुनैव* भगवताभ्यधायि । ततश्च तत्त्वज्ञानमेवेदं तत्त्वज्ञानमालया परिपोष्यमाणमिति न निर्वेदः स्थायी; **किन्तु तत्त्वज्ञानमेव स्थायी भवेत्** । यत्तु व्यभिचारिव्याख्यानावसरे वक्ष्यते तच्चिरकालविभ्रमविप्रलब्धस्योपादेयत्वनिवृत्तये यत्सम्यग्ज्ञानम्, यथा—

वृथा दुग्धोऽनड्वान् स्तनभरनता गौरिति परं
परिष्वक्तः षण्डो युवतिरिति लावण्यरहितः ।
कृता वैदूर्याशा विकचकिरणे काचशकले
मया मूढेन त्वां कृपणमगुणज्ञं प्रणमता ॥

इति तन्निर्वेदस्य खेदरूपस्य ^विभावत्वेन; एतच्च तत्रैव वक्ष्यामः ॥

ननु मिथ्याज्ञानमूलो विषयगन्धः तत्त्वज्ञानात् प्रशाम्यतीति दुःखजन्मसूत्रेण अक्षपादपादैः भगवद्भिः मिथ्याज्ञानापचयकारणं[1] तत्त्वज्ञानं वैराग्यस्य दोषापायलक्षणस्य कारणमुक्तम् । ननु ततः किम्? ननु वैराग्यं निर्वेदः? क एवमाह? निर्वेदो हि शोकप्रवाहप्रसररूपश्चित्तवृत्तिविशेषः । वैराग्यं तु रागादीनां प्रध्वंसः । भवतु वा वैराग्यमेव निर्वेदः । तथापि तस्य

* Not by Patañjali, but by Vyāsa in this Bhāṣya. (Ānandās'rama Edn., p. 20.)

^ This is read as भावत्वेन in one of the two Māngāv MSS. Both M. and G. have विभावत्वेन. Hemacandra also reads only विभावत्वेन. (p. 81, K. Anu. vyā.)

[1] M. and G. कारणतत्त्वज्ञान.

स्वकारणवशात् मध्यभाविनोऽपि न मोक्षे साध्ये सूत्रस्थानीयता [1]प्रत्यपादि आचार्येण । किञ्च तत्त्वज्ञानोत्थितो निर्वेद इति शमस्यैवेदं निर्वेदनाम कृतं स्यात् । शमशान्तयोः पर्यायत्वं तु हासहास्याभ्यां व्याख्यातम्; [2]सिद्ध-साध्यतया, [3]लौकिकालौकिकत्वेन साधारणासाधारणतया च वैलक्षण्यं शमशान्तयोरपि सुलभमेव । तस्मान्न निर्वेदः स्थायीति ॥

अन्ये मन्यन्ते रत्यादय एवाष्टौ चित्तवृत्तिविशेषा उक्ताः । तत एव कथितविभावविविक्तश्रुताद्यलौकिकविभावविशेषसंश्रयाः विचित्रा एव तावत् । ततश्च तन्मध्यादेव अन्यतमोऽत्र स्थायी । तत्र अनाहता[4]नन्दमयस्वात्म-विषया रतिरेव मोक्षसाधनमिति, सैव [5]शान्ते स्थायिनीति । यथोक्तम्—

> यश्चात्**मरति**रेव स्यात् आत्मतृप्तश्च मानवः ।
> आत्मन्येव च सन्तुष्टः तस्य कार्यं न विद्यते ॥ (गीता. ३-१७.)

इति । एवं समस्तविषयं **वैकृतं पश्यतः,** विश्वं च **शोच्यं** विलोकयतः, सांसारिकं च वृत्तान्तम् **अपकारित्वेन** पश्यतः, सातिशयमसम्मोहप्रधानं **वीर्यम्**[6] आश्रितवतः, सर्वस्मात् विषयसार्थाद् **बिभ्यतः,**[7] सर्वलोकस्पृहणी-यादपि प्रमदादेः जुगुप्समानस्य, [8]अपूर्वस्वात्मातिशयलाभात् विस्मयमानस्य मोक्षसिद्धिरिति [9]रतिहासादीनां विस्मयान्तानाम् अन्यतमस्य स्थायित्वं

[1] M. त्यपादाचारिव ; G. त्यपादाचारिव.
[2] M. and G. सिद्धं साध्यते.
[3] M. and G. यदलौकिकत्वेन.
[4] M. and G. आनन.
[5] M. and G. शास्त्रे.
[6] M. and G. विनियम्.
[7] M. and G. बाह्यतः
[8] M. and G. पूर्वस्वात्म.
[9] रति is omitted in M. and G.

निरूपणीयम् । न चैतन्मुनेर्न सम्मतम् । यावदेव हि विशिष्टान् [1]भावान् परिगणयति [2]रत्यादिशब्देन चशब्देन च तत्प्रकारानेव अन्यान् सङ्गृह्णीते, तावदेव तद्व्यतिरिक्तालौकिकहेतूपनतानां रत्यादीनामनुजानात्येव अपवर्ग-विषयत्वम् । एवंवादिनां तु परस्परमेव [3]विशारयताम् एकस्य स्थायित्वं विशीर्यत एव । तदुपायभेदात् तस्य तस्य स्थायित्वमित्यप्युच्य-मानं प्रत्युक्तमेव[4] । स्थायिभेदेन प्रतिपुरुषं रसस्याप्यानन्त्यापत्तेः[5] । मोक्षैकहेतुत्वाद् एको रस इति चेत्, [6]क्षयैकफलत्वे वीररौद्रयोरप्येकत्वं स्यात् ॥

अन्ये तु पानकरसवदविभागं प्राप्ताः सर्व एव रत्यादयोऽत्र स्यायिन इत्याहुः । चित्तवृत्तीनामयुगपद्भावात्, अन्योन्यं च विरोधाद् एतदपि न मनोज्ञम् ॥

कस्तर्ह्यत्र स्थायी ? उच्यते—इह तत्त्वज्ञानमेव तावन्मोक्षसाधन-मिति तस्यैव मोक्षे स्थायिता युक्ता । तत्त्वज्ञानं च नामात्मज्ञानमेव । आत्मनश्च व्यतिरिक्तस्य विषयस्यैव[7] ज्ञानम्; परो ह्येव[8]मात्मा अनात्मैव स्यात् । विपञ्चितं चैतदस्मद्गुरुभिः । अस्माभिश्चान्यत्र वितन्यत इति इह नातिनिर्बन्धः कृतः । तेन आत्मैव ज्ञानानन्दादिविशुद्धधर्मयोगी परिकल्पि-तविषयोपभोगरहितोऽत्र स्थायी । न चास्य स्थायितया स्थायित्वं वचनीयम् ।

[1] M. and G. विभावान्.
[2] M. and G. परिगणयत्यादिशब्देन च तत्प्रकारानेव.
[3] M. and G. विचारयतां.
[4] M. and G. प्रगुणमेव.
[5] M. and G. आपत्तौ.
[6] M. क्षमैक० ; G. क्षामैक०.
[7] M. व्यतिरिक्तस्योदयस्यैव ज्ञानम् ; G. व्यतिरिक्त इन्द्रियस्यैव ज्ञानं.
[8] M. and G. आत्मनात्मैव.

रत्यादयो हि तत्तत्कारणान्तरोदयप्रलयोत्पद्यमाननिरुध्यमान[1]वृत्तयः कञ्चित् कालम् [2]आपेक्षिकतया स्थायिरूपात्मभित्तिसंश्रयाः [3]सन्तः स्थायिन इति उच्यन्ते। तत्त्वज्ञानं तु सकलभावान्तरभित्तिस्थानीयं सर्वस्थायिभ्यः स्थायितमं सर्वा [A]रत्यादिकाः चित्तवृत्तीः[4] व्यभिचारीभावयन्[5] निसर्गत एव सिद्धस्थायिभावमिति [6]तन्न वचनीयम्। अत एव पृथगस्य गणना न युक्ता। न हि खण्डमुण्डयोर्मध्ये तृतीयं गोत्वमिति गण्यते। तेन एकान्न-पञ्चशद्भावा इत्यव्याहतमेव। अस्यापि कथं न[7] पृथग्गणनेति चेत् पृथग् [8]आस्वादायोगादिति ब्रूमहे। न हि रत्यादय इवेतरा[9]संपृक्तेन वपुषा तथाविधमात्मरूपं लौकिकप्रतीतिगोचरः[10]। स्वगतमपि अविकल्परूपं व्युत्थानावसरेऽनुसन्धीयमानं चित्तवृत्त्यन्तरकलुषमेवावभाति॥

भासतां वा लोके तथा। तथापि न संभवन्मात्रस्थायिनां गणनम्, रसेषूक्तेषु अनुपयोगात्; अपि तु व्यभिचारित्वेन[11] लक्षणीयत्वं विज्ञायते, नेतरथा[12]। तथा ह्येकान्नपञ्चाशद्भावैरिति एतत्प्रघट्टकोपपत्तिः। न चास्यात्म-

[1] M. विरुद्धमान.

[2] M. आक्षेप्यकतया

[3] M. G. and Hemacandra omit सन्तः

[A] Māngāv रत्यादिकाः स्थायिचित्तवृत्तीः So also Hemacandra.

[4] M. वृत्ति.

[5] M. भावयन्ति सर्गतः

[6] M. and G. तन्त्रवचनेन.

[7] M. and G. omit न.

[8] M. and G. आस्वादयोगात्.

[9] M. असंवृत्तेन.

[10] G. गोचरम्.

[11] M. व्यभिचारित्वात्; G. व्यभिचारिलक्षणीयत्वम्.

[12] G. नेति.

स्वभावस्य[1] व्यभिचारित्वम्; असम्भवात्, अवैचित्र्यावहत्वात्, अनौचित्याच्च। शम आत्मस्वभावः; स शमशब्देन[2] मुनिना व्यपदिष्टः। यदि तु स एव शमशब्देन व्यपदिश्यते, निर्वेदशब्देन वा, तन्न कश्चिद्बाधः,[3]। केवलं शमश्चित्तवृत्यन्तरं[4] निर्वेदोऽपि दारिद्र्यादिविभावान्तरोत्थितनिर्वेदतुल्यजातीयः स[5] भवति। तज्जातीय एव हेतुभेदेऽपि तद्व्यपदेश्यो रतिभयादिरिव[6]। तदिदमात्मस्वरूपमेव तत्त्वज्ञानं [7]शमः, तथा च यत्कालुष्योपरागविशेषा एवात्मनो रत्यादयः; तदनुगमेऽपि [8]शुद्धमस्य रूपम् अव्यवधानसमाधिबलाद् [9]अधिगम्य, व्युत्थानेऽपि [10]प्रशान्तता [11]भवति। यथोक्तम् 'प्रशान्तवाहितासंस्कारात्' (यो० सू० ३. १०) इति। तत्त्वज्ञानलक्षणस्य च स्थायिनः समस्तोऽयं लौकिकालौकिकचित्तवृत्तिकलापो व्यभिचारितामभ्येति। तदनुभावा एव च यमनियमाद्युपकृता[12] अनुभावाः [13]उपाङ्गाभिनयाद्यध्यायत्रये च ये स्वभावाभिनया वक्ष्यन्ते। अत

[1] M. and G. व्यभिचारित्वसंभवात्.

[2] M. and G. समात्मस्वभावस्य दमशब्देन.

[3] M. and G. भावः

[4] M. and G. चित्तवृत्त्यन्तम्.

[5] M. and G. न.

[6] M. and G. भयादिभिरेव.

[7] M. and G. शमता च.

[8] G. विशुद्धम्.

[9] M. and G. अधिशय्य.

[10] M. and G. प्रशान्तिता.

[11] M. and G. भवन्ति.

[12] G. अनुकृताः

[13] M. अनुभावात् उपाङ्गाभिनयस्य . . . ध्यायत्रये; G. उपाङ्गाभिनयस्य (आङ्गिका) ध्यायत्रये.

एते एतद्विषया एव । अयमेव हि स्वभावः । विभावा अपि[1] परमेश्वरानुग्रहप्रभृतयः, [2]प्रक्षयोन्मुखाश्च रत्यादयोऽत्रास्वाद्याः । केवलं यथा विप्रलम्भे औत्सुक्यम्, सम्भोगेऽपि वा 'प्रेमासमाप्तोत्सवम्' इति, यथा च रौद्रे औग्रचम्, यथा च करुणवीरभयानकाद्भुतेषु निर्वेदधृति[3]त्रासहर्षाः व्यभिचारिणोऽपि प्राधान्येन अवभासन्ते, तथा [4]शान्ते जुगुप्साद्याः सर्वथैव रागप्रतिपक्षत्वात् । तथा हि महाव्रते [5]नृकपालादिधारणम्, [6]असुभार्यादिसमुदायादिविस्तारसंक्षेपातिकर्मीकृतिर्हि धर्मे? जुगुप्साहेतुत्वेनैव निजाभ्यञ्जनं[7] च देवरात् पुत्रजन्मनि[8] उपदिष्टम् । स्वात्मनि च कृतकृत्यस्य परार्थघटनायामेवोद्यम इति उत्साहोऽस्य परोपकारविषयेच्छाप्रयत्नरूपो दयापरपर्यायोऽभ्यधिकोऽन्तरङ्गः । अत एव [9]एतद्व्यभिचारिबलात् केचिद् दयावीरत्वेन व्यपदिशन्ति, अन्ये धर्मवीरत्वेन ॥

ननूत्साहोऽहङ्कारप्राणः शान्तस्त्वहङ्कारशैथिल्यात्मकः[10] । व्यभिचारित्वं हि विरुद्धस्यापि[11] न नोचितम्, रताविव निर्वेदादेः । 'शय्या शाद्वलम्' (नागा० ४. २) इत्यादौ हि परोपकारकरणे ह्युत्साहस्यैव प्रकर्षो

[1] M. and G. कथम् additional.

[2] M. वृक्षयोश्च रत्यादयः

[3] M. निर्वृति.

[4] M. and G. न जुगुप्सायां द्वैविध्यात्मक.

[5] M. and G. महाव्रतेन.

[6] This bit both in M. and G. is very corrupt and suitable emendation was very difficult to be found. Unfortunately, Hemacandra's epitome of this portion does not contain this passage. (p. 81.)

[7] M. निजाभ्यनम्; G. निजाभ्यर्हणम्.

[8] M. and G. पुत्रजन्माद्युपदिष्टम्.

[9] G. तत्केचित्; M. Gap.

[10] M. and G. शैथिल्यात.

[11] G. and Hema. नानुचितम्.

लक्ष्यते । न तु[1] उत्साहशून्या काचिदप्यवस्था[2]; इच्छाप्रयत्नव्यतिरेकेण पाषाणतापत्तेः । यत एव च[3] परिदृष्टपरावरत्वेन[4] स्वात्मोद्देशेन कर्तव्यान्तरं नावशिष्यते । अत एव शान्तहृदयानां परोपकाराय शरीरसर्वस्वादिदानं न शान्तविरोधि । 'आत्मानं गोपायेत्' इत्यादिना ह्यकृतकृत्यविषयं शरीर[5]-रक्षणमुपदिश्यते, सन्न्यासिनां [6]तद्रक्षादितात्पर्याभावात् । तथा हि—

'धर्मार्थकाममोक्षाणां प्राणाः संस्थितिहेतवः ।
तान्निघ्नता किं न हतं रक्षता किं न रक्षितम् ॥' इति

सुप्रसिद्धचतुर्वर्गसाधकत्वमेव देहरक्षाया निदानं दर्शितम् । कृतकृत्यस्य जलेऽग्नौ श्वभ्रे वा पतेदिति सन्न्यासित्वे श्रवणात् । तद्यथाकथञ्चित् त्याज्यं शरीरम् । यदि परार्थं त्यज्यते तत् किमिव न संपादितं भवति? जीमूतवाहनादीनां न [7]यतित्वमिति चेत्, किं तेन नः? तत्त्वज्ञानित्वं तावदवश्यमस्ति । अन्यथा देहात्ममानिनां देह एव सर्वस्वभूते धर्माद्यनुद्देशेन परार्थे त्यागस्य [8]असम्भाव्यत्वात् । युद्धेऽपि हि न वीरस्य देहत्यागायोद्यमः[9], [10]परावजयोद्देशेनैव प्रवृत्तेः । भृगुपतनादावपि शुभतरदेहान्तरसंपिपादयिषैवाधिकं विजृम्भते । तत् स्वार्थानुद्देशेन परार्थसम्पत्त्यै यद्यच्चेष्टितं देहत्याग-

[1] M. and Hema. नु

[2] M. अव्यवस्थायी.

[3] च is omitted in M. and G.

[4] M. परापरत्वेन ; G. and Hema. परम्परत्वेन.

[5] M. भूतताम्; लक्षणम्.

[6] M. तद्दक्षादि.

[7] M. G. and Hema. नयतत्त्वम्.

[8] M. and G. असम्भवात्.

[9] M. युद्धे विहीनशरीरस्य त्यागोद्यमः; G. युद्धेऽपि हि न शरीरस्य त्यागायोद्यमः

[10] M. पराजय०; G. परपराजय०.

पर्यन्तमुपदेशदानादि तत्तदलब्धात्मतत्त्वज्ञानानामसम्भाव्यमेवेति । तेऽपि तत्त्वज्ञानिनः । [1]ज्ञानिनां सर्वाश्रमेषु मुक्तिरिति स्मृतिषु श्रुतिषु च । यथोक्तम्—

‘ देवार्चनरतस्तत्त्वज्ञाननिष्ठोऽतिथिप्रियः ।
श्राद्धं[2] कृत्वा ददद् द्रव्यं गृहस्थोऽपि हि मुच्यते ॥ ’ इति ।

केवलं [3]परार्थाभिसन्धिजात् धर्मात् परोपकारात्मकफलत्वेनैव अभिसंहितात् पुनरपि देहस्य तदुचितस्यैव प्रादुर्भावो बोधिसत्त्वादीनां तत्त्वज्ञानिनामपि ॥

दृष्टः अङ्गेष्वपि[4] विश्रान्तिलाभः, स्वभावौचित्यात्, यथा रामस्य वीराङ्गे[5] पितुराज्ञां पालयतः । एवं शृङ्गाराद्यङ्गेष्वपि मन्तव्यम् । [6]अत एव शान्तस्य स्थायित्वेऽपि अप्राधान्यम् । जीमूतवाहने त्रिवर्गसम्पत्तेरेव परोपकृतिप्रधानायाः फलत्वात् । अनेनैवाशयेन नाटकलक्षणे वक्ष्यते— ‘ ऋद्धिविलासादिभि[7]र्गुणैः ’ (19-11) इति । अनेन हि ऋद्धिविलास[8]-प्रधानमर्थकामोत्तरं सर्वं चरितं सकललोकहृदयसंवादसुन्दरप्रयोजनं नाटके निवेशयितव्यमित्युक्तम् । एतच्च तत्रैव वर्णयिष्यामः । अनेनैव चाशयेन न शान्ते कश्चन मुनिना जात्यङ्गको विनियोक्ष्यते (*Vide* Ch. 29 S'ls. 1-4) तेन जात्यङ्गविनियोगाभावात् तदसत्त्वमिति प्रत्युक्तम् ॥

[1] G. तत्त्वज्ञानिनाम्.
[2] M. श्रद्धी चरेदविद्यावित्.
[3] M. परार्थो हि सन्धिजात्.
[4] दृष्टः अङ्गेष्वपि is not found in M.
[5] M. and G. वीराङ्गम्.
[6] M. एत एव.
[7] M. विशालादिभिः
[8] M. विशाल.

अन्ये तु, ‘ [1]जीमूतवाहनस्ते पुत्रत्राता भविष्यति ’ (नागा० ४-९) इति शरणार्थिनीं वृद्धामेव त्रातवान् । शक्तिश्चास्य न काचित् । परहिंसा च न काचिदित्येवमाहुः । तच्चानुमतमेव ; न हि बोधिसत्त्वानां पुनः [2]अभ्युत्थानात्मकजीवितमभिसन्धानानुप्रविष्टं शक्तिश्चेदिति । न च काकतालीयवृत्त्या शास्त्रमुपदिशति । तत् सिद्धं दयालक्षणो ह्युत्साहोऽत्र प्रधानम् । अन्ये तु व्यभिचारिणो यथायोगं भवन्तीति । यथोक्तम् ‘ तच्छिद्रेषु प्रत्ययान्तराणि संस्कारेभ्यः ’ (यो० सू० ४. २७) इति । अत एव निश्चेष्टत्वादनुभावाभाव इति प्रत्युक्तम् । यदा तु पर्यन्तभूमिका[3]लाभेऽनुभावाभावः, तदास्य अप्रयोज्यत्वम्, रतिशोकादावपि पर्यन्तशायाम् अप्रयोगस्य युक्तत्वात् । हृदयसंवादोऽपि तथाविधतत्त्वज्ञानबीजसंस्कारभावितानां भवत्येव ; यद्वक्ष्यति “ मोक्षे चापि विरगिणः ” (अध्यायः २७—श्लो. ५९) इति । सर्वस्य [4]न सर्वत्र हृदयसंवादः, भयानके वीरप्रकृतेरभावात् । ननु तादृशि प्रयोगे वीरस्य क आस्वादः । उच्यते—यत्रायं[5] निबध्यते, तत्रावश्यं पुरुषार्थोपयोगिनि शृङ्गारवीराद्यन्यतममस्त्येव । तन्निष्ठस्तेषामास्वादः । यत्रापि प्रहसनादौ हास्यादेः प्रधानता तत्राप्य[6]नुनिष्पादिरसान्तरनिष्ठ एवास्वादः[7] । [8]भिन्नभिन्नाधिकार्यास्वादोद्देश एव रूपकभेदचिन्तने निमित्तमिति केचित् ॥

[1] M. जीमूतवाहन कस्ते ; G. जीमूतवाहनः कस्ते.
[2] M. and G. पुनरप्युत्थान०
[3] M. ला हेतुभावाभावः ; G. लाभे तु भावाभावः
[4] M. इत्यत्र ; G. त्वित्यत्र.
[5] M. यत्रेयं ; G. यत्रेयं(दं.)
[6] G. अनुनिष्पादित०
[7] M. and G. आस्वाद०
[8] M. and G. भिन्नभिन्नादिकार्यं . . . . धिकादेऽप्युद्देशे दैवरूपकभेदचिन्तनं निमित्तमिति केचित् ।

तस्मादस्ति शान्तो रसः । तथा च चिरन्तनपुस्तकेषु ‘स्थायिभावान् रसत्वमुपनेष्यामः’ इत्यनन्तरं शान्तो नाम शमस्थायिभावात्मक इत्यादिशान्तलक्षणं पठ्यते । तत्र सर्वरसानां शान्तप्राय एवास्वादः[1], विषयेभ्यो विपरिवृत्त्या । तन्मुख्यतालाभः[2] केवलं वासनान्तरोपहित इति । अत्र सर्वप्रकृतित्वाभिधानाय पूर्वमभिधानम् । लोके च पृथक् पृथक् सामान्यस्य न गणनमिति स्थाय्यस्य पृथङ् [3]नोक्तः । सामान्यमपि तु विवेचकेन पृथगेव गणनीयमिति विवेचकाभिमतसामाजिकास्वादलक्षणप्रतीतिविषयतया स पृथग्भूत एव । इतिहासपुराणाभिधानकोशादौ च नव रसाः श्रूयन्ते, श्रीमत्सिद्धान्तशास्त्रेष्वपि । तथा चोक्तम्—

“ अष्टानामिह देवानां शृङ्गारादीन् प्रदर्शयेत् ।
मध्ये च देवदेवस्य शान्तं रूपं प्रदर्शयेत् ॥ ”

तस्य च वैराग्यसंसारभीरुतादयो विभावाः । स हि तैरुपनिबद्धैर्विज्ञायते । मोक्षशास्त्रचिन्तादयोऽनुभावाः । निर्वेदमतिस्मृतिधृत्यादयो व्यभिचारिणः । अत एव ईश्वरप्रणिधानविषये भक्तिश्रद्धे स्मृतिमतिधृत्यु[4]त्साहानुप्रविष्टेऽन्यथैवाङ्गमिति न तयोः पृथग्रसत्वेन गणनम् । अत्र सङ्ग्रहकारिका—

मोक्षाध्यात्मनिमित्तस्तत्त्वज्ञानार्थहेतुसंयुक्तः ।
निःश्रेयसधर्मयुतः शान्तरसो नाम विज्ञेयः ॥

विभावस्थाय्यनुभावयोगः क्रमात् विशेषणत्रयेण दर्शितः ।

[1] There is a न here in M. and G.

[2] M. and G. लाभात्.

[3] M. युक्त०

[4] M. उत्साहान्यनुप्रविष्टेभ्यः; G. उत्साहाद्यनुप्रविष्टेभ्यः

स्वं स्वं निमित्तमादाय शान्तादुत्पद्यते रसः ।
पुनर्निमित्तापाये तु शान्त एव प्रलीयते ॥

इत्यादिना रसान्तरप्रकृतित्वमुपसंहृतम् ॥

यत्तु डिमे हास्यशृङ्गारपरिहारेण षड्रसत्वं च वक्ष्यते, तत्रायं भावः । ‘दीप्तरसकाव्ययोनिः’ (xxviii. 83) इति भाविना लक्षणेन रौद्रप्रधाने तावड्डिमे तद्विरुद्धस्य शान्तस्य सम्भावनैव न, किं निषेधेन । शान्तासम्भवे तु दीप्तरसकाव्ययोनिरित्येतेन किं व्यवच्छेद्यं शृङ्गारहास्यवर्जं षड्रसयुक्त इति ह्युक्ते नातिप्रसङ्गः[1] । ननु करुणबीभत्सभयानकप्राधान्यमनेन पादेन व्यवच्छेद्यते । नैतत्, सात्त्वत्यारभटीवृत्तिसम्पन्न[2] इत्यनेनैव तन्निरासात् । शान्ते तु सात्त्वत्येव वृत्तिरिति न[3] तद्व्यवच्छेदकमेवैतत् । तेन डिमलक्षणं प्रत्युत शान्तरसस्य सद्भावे लिङ्गम् । शृङ्गारस्तु प्रसभसेव्यमानः सम्भाव्य एव । तदङ्गं च हास्य इति तयोरेव प्रतिषेधः कृतः, प्राप्तत्वात् । सर्वसाम्याच्च विशेषतो वर्णदेवताभिधानमनुचितमप्यस्य तत्कल्पितमिति ज्ञेयम् । [4]उत्पत्तिस्तु शान्तस्यापि दर्शितैव । [5]सत्त्वभावो हि हास्यस्सः[6] । विभावत्वेन चास्य वीरबीभत्सौ । अत एवास्य रसस्य यमनियमेश्वरप्रणिधानाद्युपदेशः[7] । अनुपयोगितया महाफलत्वं सर्वप्राधान्यमितिवृत्तव्यापकत्वं चोपपन्नमिति अलमतिप्रसङ्गेन ॥

[1] M. and G. तत्र प्रसङ्गः

[2] M. and G. सम्पन्नेनैव.

[3] M. and G. omit न.

[4] M. and G. उपपत्तिः

[5] G. सत्त्वाभावः

[6] M. and G. सहविभावित्वेन.

[7] G. उपदेशे.

तत्त्वास्वादोऽस्य कीदृशः ? उच्यते—उपरागदायिभिः उत्साहरत्यादिभिरुपरक्तं यदात्मस्वरूपं तदेव विरलोम्भितरत्नान्तरालनिर्भासमानसिततरसूत्रवद्[1] यदाहिततत्स्वरूपं सकलेषु रत्यादिषु उपरञ्जकेषु तथाभावेनापि सकृद्विभातोऽयमात्मेति न्यायेन भासमानं [2]पराङ्मुखतात्मक[3] सकलदुःखजालहीनं परमानन्दलाभसंविदेकत्वेन काव्यप्रयोगप्रबन्धाभ्यां साधारणतया निर्भासमानं अन्तर्मुखावस्थाभेदेन लोकोत्तरानन्दानयनं तथाविधहृदयं विधत्त इति ॥

[4]एते नवैव रसाः, पुमर्थोपयोगित्वेन रञ्जनाधिक्येन वा इयतामेव उपदेश्यत्वात् । तेन रसान्तरसम्भवे अपि [5]पार्षदप्रसिद्ध्या सङ्ख्यानियम इति यदन्यैरुक्तं तत्प्रत्युक्तम् । भावाध्याये चैतद्वक्ष्यते । आर्द्रतास्थायिकः स्नेहो रस इति त्वसत् । स्नेहो ह्यभिषङ्गः । स च सर्वो रत्युत्साहादावेव पर्यवस्यति । तथाहि बालस्य मातापित्रादौ स्नेहः[6] भये[A]विश्रान्तः, यूनोः[B] मित्रजने रतौ, लक्ष्मणादेः[C] भ्रातरि स्नेहः धर्मवीर[7] एव । एवं वृद्धस्य पुत्रादावपि द्रष्टव्यम् । एषैव [8]गर्धस्थायिकस्य लौल्यरसस्य प्रत्याख्याने सरणिर्मन्तव्या, हासे वा रतौ वा अन्यत्र पर्यवसानात् । एवं भक्तावपि वाच्यमिति ॥ ”

[1] M. सूत्रं यदाह तत्स्वरूपम् ; G. सूत्रवदाभातस्वरूपम्.
[2] M. परोन्मुखता०
[3] M. आत्म०
[4] M. and G. एवं ते.
[5] M. पार्षतः ; G. पार्षत[:].
[6] M. and G. स्नेहोदये विश्रान्तः
[A] Both the Māngāv MSS. and Hema. read भये which is better than स्नेहोदये or स्नेहो दया (विश्रान्तः)
[B] Both the Māngāv MSS. and Hema. read यूनो मित्र०.
[C] Both the Māngāv MSS. and Hema. read लक्ष्मणादेः which is better than the M. and G. reading लक्ष्मणादौ.
[7] M. धर्मविरसः ; G. धर्मविरमः
[8] M. and G. गन्धस्थायिकस्य.

VI

Preyas, Vātsalya, Prīti, Sneha, Bhakti and S'raddhā Rasas

The incoming of the S'ānta rasa seems to have set the writers thinking on the sanctity or otherwise of the number eight or nine pertaining to the Rasas.[1] Close on the footsteps of S'ānta, an aspect of Love called Preyas or Vātsalya, covering cases of non-sexual love like that between parents and children, elders and youngsters, became a Rasa. The first work we now know mentioning it as the tenth Rasa is the K. A. of Rudraṭa (Ch. XII, S'l. 3). Preyas is found in Udbhaṭa as an Alaṁkāra by the side of Rasavat, both of which belong to a separate class of emotion-figures. Udbhaṭa considers Preyas as the poetry of Bhāva, Bhāva kāvya, and distinguishes it from the poetry of Rasa called Rasavat. In Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, Preyas was a kind of sweet compliment born of devotion or love, प्रेयः प्रियतराख्यानम्. In this sense, Preyas as Cāṭu lives in later literature also. But Udbhaṭa's view is peculiar. As Pratīhārendurāja observes, any Bhāva is Preyas for Udbhaṭa.

[1] Mr. S'ivaprasāda Bhaṭṭācārya, in his Skr. gloss (in his Edn.) of the Alaṁkāra Kaustubha of Kavikarṇapūra Gosvāmin in the Varendra Research Society Series, says that some Ālaṁkārikas, following the Pāka s'āstra and the Vaidya s'āstra, hold Rasas to be six in number.

“ षड् रसा इति रसज्ञा भिषजः, तदनुसारिणः केचिदलङ्कारमार्गगा अपि । ”

The basis of this statement is not given; and I have not been able to find the Ālaṁkārikas who held Rasas to be six.

"एवं भावकाव्यस्य प्रेयस्स्वदिति लक्षणया व्यपदेशः ।"

This view found no follower, since Udbhaṭa's view of Bhāva kāvya and Rasa kāvya and his view of Bhāva or Rasa being indicated by their own names met with criticism. The older Preyas of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin as speech expressive of non-sexual love developed into a new Rasa. Daṇḍin says that this Preyas is very closely related to S'ṛṅgāra but is distinct, since Prīti is the Sthāyin of the former whereas Rati is the Sthāyin of S'ṛṅgāra.

प्राक् प्रीतिर्दर्शिता सेयं रतिः शृङ्गारतां गता ।

Daṇḍin, II, 289.

Friendship or Affection of parents—Sneha and Vātsalya—feature in some of the noblest poetry and there was felt a necessity to recognise a Rasa for such situations. Rudraṭa who introduces Preyān at first, mentions Sneha as its Sthāyin—स्नेहप्रकृतिः प्रेयान् । That Rudraṭa thought mainly of Friendship is shown not only by the Sthāyin but also by the following explication—

अन्योन्यं प्रति सुहृदोर्व्यवहारोऽयं मतस्तत्र । XVI, 18.

We now get three categories of non-sexual attachment or affection,—(i) the Preyas of Rudraṭa with Sneha as its Sthāyin which comes to friendship; (ii) Vātsalya or the affection of parents and elders for children and youngsters[1] and (iii) Prīti,

[1] Vis'vanātha calls this Vatsala, describes it as paternal affection and gives it in his S. D. after giving the 8 old Rasas and the S'ānta, the 9th.

"अथ मुनीन्द्रसंमतो वत्सलः—

'स्फुटं चमत्कारितया वत्सलं च रसं विदुः ।
स्थायी वत्सलता स्नेहः पुत्राद्यालम्बनं मतम् ॥

the other kinds of attachment like that between a leader and a follower, a king and his officer or court-poet. To these is to be added the fourth, Bhakti,[1] reverence to elders and devotion to God.

All these aspects, to begin with, were called only Preyas which then was understood as all types of non-sexual love.

प्रीतिरप्येवमेव स्यान्न त्वस्यां सांप्रयोगिकी । Bhoja, S. K. Ā., V.

Daṇḍin's Preyas, as his two illustrations show, refer only to the fourth aspect called Bhakti. He actually calls it by the name Bhakti and uses as its synonym, Prīti. Commenting

उद्दीपनानि तच्चेष्टा विद्याशौर्योदयादयः ।
आलिङ्गनाङ्गसंस्पर्शशिरश्चुम्बनमीक्षणम् ॥
पुलकानन्दबाष्पाद्या अनुभावाः प्रकीर्तिताः ।
सञ्चारिणोऽनिष्टशङ्काहर्षगर्वादयो मताः ॥
पद्मगर्भच्छविर्वर्णो दैवतं लोकमातरः ॥"

The illustration given is Raghu's childhood and Dilīpa's Vātsalya (R. V. III). The Mandāramarandacampū curiously enough considers Karuṇā or Kāruṇya—Compassion—as the Sthāyin of Vātsalya:

अन्ये तु करुणास्थायी वात्सल्यं दशमोऽपि च । K. M. edn., p. 100.

Kavikarṇapūra Gosvāmin, who illustrates Vātsalya with Yas'odā's love for baby-Kṛṣṇa, gives Mamakāra as its Sthāyin—

'अत्र ममकारः स्थायी ।' p. 148.

[1] Kavikarṇapūra classifies Love into sexual love—Sāmprayogikī Prīti, Maitrī, Sauhārda and Bhāva. The last is the Sthāyin of Bhakti. "तत्र रतिर्यथा

"रतिश्चेतोरञ्जकता सुखभोगानुकूल्यकृत् ।
सा प्रीति-मैत्री-सौहार्द-भावसंज्ञाश्च गच्छति ॥"

A. K., Ch. V, Varendra Edn., p. 124.

on Vidura's words spoken on Kṛṣṇa's arrival at his house, Daṇḍin says:

> इत्याह युक्तं विदुरो नान्यतस्तादृशी धृतिः ।
> भक्तिमात्रसमाराध्यः सुप्रीतश्च ततो हरिः ॥ K. Ā., II, 277.

Tho other instance is the manifestation of a king's devotion to S'iva, uttered in the form of a Stotra on seeing Him:

> इति साक्षात्कृते देवे राज्ञो यद्राजवर्मणः ।
> प्रीतिप्रकाशनं तच्च प्रेय इत्यवगम्यताम् ॥ II, 279.

It is quite natural that in our literature, Bhakti should have come in as a dominant motif and that scholars should have accepted it as a distinct Rasa. Though Rudraṭa mentions only the Preyas of Sneha, we find the Abhinavabhāratī saying that others propose not only Bhakti but S'raddhā, Faith, also as a new Rasa. Abhinava however does not consider them as distinct Rasas but includes them in S'ānta of which the two are important accessories.

> "अत एव ईश्वरप्रणिधानविषये भक्तिश्रद्धे स्मृतिमतिधृत्युत्साहानुप्रविष्टे अन्यथैव अङ्गम् (शान्तस्य) इनि न तयोः पृथग्रसत्वेन गणनम् ॥"[1]
>
> Abhi. Bhā., I, Ch. VI, p. 340.

Of Bhakti, more will be said in the section on Madhura Rasa. The Das'arūpaka mentions Prīti and Bhakti separately as *Bhāvas* and includes them in Harṣa, Utsāha or some other similar Bhāva. (IV, 84).

[1] Hemacandra reproduces this discussion on the additional Rasas from the Abhi. Bha. *See* K. A., p. 68, Text and Com. S'ivarāma's Rasaratnahāra seems to be another work which speaks of the S'raddhā Rasa and includes it in one of the nine accepted Rasas.

> प्रीतिभक्त्यादयो भावाः . . . . |
> हर्षोत्साहादिषु स्पष्टमन्तर्भावान्न कीर्तिताः ॥

Prīti here means types of love other than Rati and Bhakti. To be clear about accepting friendship as Rasa, some seem to have called Sneha itself as a Rasa. Rudraṭa used the name Sneha for the Sthāyin and called the Rasa, Preyān; but these proposed Sneha as the Rasa and Ārdratā as the Sthāyin. Rudraṭa himself mentioned this Ārdratā while describing his Sneha Sthāyin:

> आर्द्रान्तःकरणतया स्नेहपदे भवति सर्वत्र । XVI, 19.

The Abhi. Bhā. thus introduces and criticises this Sneha rasa with Ārdratā as its Sthāyin:

> "आर्द्रतास्थायिकः स्नेहो रस इति त्वसत् । स्नेहो ह्यभिषङ्गः । स च रत्युत्साहादावेव पर्यवस्यति । तथा हि---बालस्य मातापित्रादौ स्नेहो भये विश्रान्तः, यूनो मित्रजने रतौ, लक्ष्मणादेः भ्रातरि धर्मवीर एव । एवं वृद्धस्य पुत्रादावपि द्रष्टव्यम् ।" Abhi. Bhā., I, p. 342.[1]

This dismisses Prīti, Sneha, Vātsalya and similar Rasas based on attachment. This is not a commendable attitude.

[1] Hemacandra, K. A. Vyā., p. 68.

"स्नेहो भक्तिर्वात्सल्यमिति हि रतेरेव विशेषाः । तुल्ययोः या परस्परं रतिः स स्नेहः । अनुत्तमस्य उत्तमे रतिः प्रसक्तिः, सैव भक्तिपदवाच्या । उत्तमस्य अनुत्तमे रतिः वात्सल्यम् । एवमादौ च विषये भावस्यैव आस्वाद्यत्वम् ॥

S'ārṅgadeva, Saṁgītaratnākara, p. 839.

> भक्तिं स्नेहं तथा लौल्यं केचित् त्रीन् मन्वते रसान् ।
> श्रद्धार्द्रताभिलाषांश्च स्थायिनस्तेषु ते विदुः ॥
> तदसत्; रतिभेदौ हि भक्तिस्नेहौ नृगोचरौ ।
> व्यभिचारित्वमनयोः; नृनार्योः स्थायिनौ तु तौ ॥

To have less distinctions is no great aim. If it is said that friendship is only a variety of Rati, can we call the Rasa in the association of Rāma and Sugrīva, S'ṛṅgāra? If brotherly attachment again is brought under Rati, is the Rasa in the association of Rāma and Bharata or Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, S'ṛṅgāra? If Dharmavīra can be called forth to deny Rasatva to Lakṣmaṇa's attachment to Rāma, why should not opponents of S'ānta call forth another kind of Vīra to deny Rasatva to S'ānta? Do Abhinava and Hemacandra mean that Friendship, Brotherly attachment, Parental affection and the like are only Bhāvas that cannot be nourished into a state of Rasa with attendant accessories? Literature is only too full of these types of attachment. The instance of Das'aratha's death due to separation from Rāma is ample proof for the existence of Vātsalya[1] as a major mood, fit to be developed and fit to be relished.

Laulya Rasa

In the same section, the Abhi. Bhā. mentions and criticises another Rasa called Laulya, of which the Sthāyin is

[1] Strangely, we find Vātsalya introduced (as a Rasa, of course) in the midst of other Rasas in the text of Bharata itself. In Ch. 17, second section, dealing with Pāṭhyaguṇas, we find with reference to Varṇas and Rasas:

"तत्र हास्यशृङ्गारयो: स्वरितोदात्तै:, वीररौद्राद्भुतेषु उदात्तकम्पितै: करुणवात्सल्यभयानकेषु अनुदात्तस्वरितकम्पितैर्वर्णै: पाठ्यमुपपादयति ।"

K. M. Edn., p. 187.

A similar strange passage occurs in Ch. 22, in S'l. 3, same edn. where Rasas are mentioned as nine:

अव्यक्तरूपं सत्त्वं हि ज्ञेयं नवरसाश्रयम् ॥

But the correct reading here is भावरसाश्रयम् as the Kās'i edn. shows.

given as Gardha. Abhinava suggests that it can be included in Hāsa, Rati or elsewhere.

एषैव गर्धस्थायिकस्य लौल्यरसस्य प्रत्याख्याने सरणिर्मन्तव्या, हासे वा, रतौ वा, अन्यत्र पर्यवसानात् । Abhi. Bhā., p. 342.

Laulya seems to have been proposed to label the Rasa of an anti-hero like Rāvaṇa whose vile passion for Sītā is enormous. This thirst of heart, Abhinava says, is inappropriate; it is not Rasa in him, but only Rasābhāsa; and this Anaucitya of his desire causes Hāsya Rasa. S'ārṅgadeva summarises Abhinava thus:

अयुक्तविषया तृष्णा लौल्यं तद्धास्यकारणम् ।

Mṛgayā and Akṣa Rasas

Even as Abhinava does, Dhanañjaya also refers to other Rasas proposed by writers. Prīti and Bhakti, two additional Bhāvas, and their inclusion by Dhanañjaya in one or the other of the Bhāvas, were referred to previously. In the same verse, Dhanañjaya refers to two additional Rasas, Mṛgayā and Akṣa, Hunt and Gambling.

प्रीतिभक्त्यादयो भावा मृगयाक्षादयो रसाः ।
हर्षोत्साहादिषु स्पष्टमन्तर्भावान्न कीर्तिताः ॥ D. R., IV, 83.

Rasa refers no longer to a mental state only; these writers generalise it very much to mean any motif or any 'idea.'

If we can infer anything from the mention of these additional Rasas by Abhinava after a reference to Lollaṭa's view that Rasas are innumerable, we may say that it was Lollaṭa who proposed these additional Rasa. Though Lollaṭa's

commentary on the N. S'. is not available, we have, about that time, the K. A. of Rudraṭa, which holds the same view on the number of Rasas as Lollaṭa is said by Abhinava to hold. These writers re-examined Bharata's text to find out what exactly constituted Rasatva and Bhāvatva. Bharata considered as Rasas those emotions which were "masters"—Svāmibhūtas, and were consequently attended upon by many minor ones, (Bahvās'rayāḥ) which are called Bhāvas. The forty-nine Bhāvas described by him include the eight Sthāyins also and these eight are once again described as Bhāva among Bhāvas. This shows that the eight Sthāyins had a Sthāyin-stage and a Bhāva-stage. When reinforced by Vyabhicārins, Rati etc. became Sthāyins. Similarly, thought some writers, other Bhāvas also can be reinforced by other attendant Bhāvas and made Sthāyins. According to this view, the Vyabhicārins themselves would have other Vyabhicārins; Nirveda is attended by Cintā; S'rama by Nirveda and so on. Says Abhinava:

"—व्यभिचारिणामपि च व्यभिचारिणो भवन्ति, यथा निर्वेदस्य चिन्ता, श्रमस्य निर्वेद इत्यादि निरूपयन्ति । तच्चासत् । Ch. VII, p. 346.

Abhinava did not accept this view.[1] But Lollaṭa's and Rudraṭa's position would make its acceptance necessary for them. Bharata says while explaining what Rasa is:

अत्र रस इति कः पदार्थः ? उच्यते ; आस्वाद्यत्वात् ।

[1] If he accepted this view, he might give a handle to those who considered all the thirty-three Vyabhicārins also as capable of becoming Rasas. So, he says, wherever there seem to occur in one Vyabhicārin many others, as for instance Vitarka etc. in Unmāda in Purūravas, it cannot be said that one Vyabhicārin is nourished by others, but it must be said that all these are separately Vyabhicārins nourishing the main Sthāyin, Vipralambha Rati.

Rudraṭa perhaps based himself on this text when he said that any Bhāva can be Rasa, because Āsvādyatva or relishability is present in it:

इति मन्तव्या रसाः सर्वे ॥ XII, 3.

रसनाद्रसत्वमेषां मधुरादीनामिवोक्तमाचार्यैः ।
निर्वेदादिष्वापि तन्निकाममस्तीति तेऽपि रसाः ॥

Only a poet must develop the Vyabhicārin also to a state of relishability. Namisādhu explains Rudraṭa clearly and observes that there is no mental state which cannot be called Rasa, if only it is developed.

"अयमाशयो ग्रन्थकारस्य—यदुत नास्ति सा कापि चित्तवृत्तिः या परिपोषं गता न रसीभवति । भरतेन सहृदयावर्जकत्वप्राचुर्यात् संज्ञां चाश्रित्य अष्टौ वा नव वा रसा उक्ता इति ।"

Rudraṭa was perhaps contemporaneous with S'aṅkuka C. 850 A.D. and thus followed Lollaṭa, C. 825 A.D., on this question of Rasas being as many as Bhāvas. If Bharata

But Bharata does not seem to support this contention of Abhinava. He seems to allow Vyabhicārins in Vyabhicārins. Defining Dainya, the Āryā in the N. S'. says: चिन्ता-औत्सुक्य-समुत्था. Ch. VII, 74, p. 362. Asūyā, a Vyabhicārin is given as an Anubhāva of another Vyabhicārin Garva (p. 369). In Autsukya, Cintā and Nidrā are given; and many other Vyabhicārins also occur here as well as in Viṣāda (p. 370).

On p. 66 of his Locana, Abhinava cites काकार्य etc. and calls it a case of Bhāvas'abalatā. He says that this verse portrays four pairs of Vyabhicārins appearing one after another: Vitarka-Autsukya; Mati-Smaraṇa; S'aṅkā-Dainya; and lastly Dhṛti-Cintā. He concludes however that finally Cintā is the Vyabhicārin which we relish. This seems to mean that the one Vyabhicārin of Cintā has other Vyabhicārins, Vitarka etc. 'पर्यन्ते तु चिन्ताया एव प्रधानतां ददती परमास्वादस्थानम् ।'

spoke only of eight or nine Bhāvas as Rasas, it is because of their greater vogue among poets and critics. According to Abhinava, Lollaṭa said the same thing:

"एतावन्त एव च रसा इत्युक्तं पूर्वम् । तेन 'आनन्त्येऽपि पार्षद-प्रसिद्ध्या एतावतां प्रयोज्यत्वम् इति यत् भट्टलोल्लटेन निरूपितं तद्वलेपना-परामृश्य(?)इत्यलम् ।" Abhi. Bhā., I, p. 299.

"तेन रसान्तरसम्भवेऽपि पार्षदप्रसिद्ध्या संख्यानियम इति यदन्यैः (लोल्लटादिभिरित्यर्थः) उक्तम्, तत्प्रत्युक्तम् । भावाध्याये चैतद्वक्ष्यते ।"
ibid., p. 341.

It is perhaps Lollaṭa who, while commenting on the text enumerating the Sthāyins, Vyabhicārins etc. at the beginning of Ch. VI, says regarding Sthāyins that Bharata did not give any fixed number for the Sthāyins; for, Abhinava says in his commentary in this place:

"स्थायिषु च सङ्ख्या नोक्तेत्यपरे ।" *ibid.*, p. 270.

Unfortunately, the Bhāvādhyāya of the Abhinavabhāratī is, for the most part, lost and Abhinava's detailed statement and refutation of Lollaṭa's view are lost to us.

Pratīhārendurāja who comes after Ānanda notices this view of Rudraṭa that Nirveda and the other Bhāvas are also Rasas. His explanation for many considering only eight or nine as Rasas is not very different from Lollaṭa's Pārṣada-prasiddhi. Pratīhārendurāja takes his stand on Caturvarga as contrasted with those objects which are to be avoided by the wise—the Parihārya. Pratīhārendu says that only nine are called Rasas because of their reference to the four Puruṣārthas and the name Rasa as restricted to these nine is 'Tāntrika', technical and traditional for this S'āstra. This is a clumsy

explanation; virtually this writer accepts the position of Rudraṭa. The 'Tāntrika' or 'Pāribhāṣika' nomenclature begs the question and one fails to see how any Bhāva, Nirveda or another, is irrelevant to a Puruṣārtha. Says Pratīhārendurāja:

"एते च शृङ्गारादयो नव यथायोगं चतुर्वर्गप्राप्त्युपायतया तदितर-परिहारनिबन्धनतया च रत्यादीनां स्थायिनां नवानां भावानां यः परिपोषः तदात्मकाः । अतः तथाविधेन रूपेण आस्वाद्यत्वात् आस्वादभेदनिबन्धनेन तान्त्रिकेण रसशब्देन अभिधीयन्ते । निर्वेदादौ तु तथाविधस्य आस्वाद्यस्य (द्यत्वस्य) अभावात् प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तभेदनिबन्धनस्य तान्त्रिकस्य रसशब्दस्य अप्रवृत्तिः । **आस्वाद्यमात्रविवक्षया तु तत्रापि मधुराम्लादिवत् रसशब्द-प्रवृत्तिरविरुद्धा** । युदुक्तं शृङ्गारादीन् रसानुपक्रम्य—

'रसनाद्रसत्वमेषां + अस्तीति तेऽपि रसाः ॥ (Rudraṭa; *see above*). इति । तदाहुः—

'चतुर्वर्गेतरौ प्राप्यपरिहार्यौ क्रमाद्यतः ।
चैतन्यभेदादास्वाद्यात् स रसस्तादृशो मतः ॥' इति ।

स इति चैतन्यभेद इत्यर्थः । तादृश इत्यनेन आस्वादविशेषनिबन्धनत्वं शृङ्गारादिषु तान्त्रिकस्य रसशब्दस्य उक्तम् ॥" K.A. S.S. Vyā., p. 49.

To some extent, the final observation of Abhinava himself at the end of the sixth chapter is weak and justifies the restriction of Rasatva to eight or nine on grounds neither stronger than nor different from Lollaṭa's Pārṣada-prasiddhi or Pratīhāra's Caturvargaprāptyupāya.

"**एते नवैव रसाः, पुमर्थोपयोगित्वेन, रञ्जनाधिक्येन वा इयतामेव उपदेश्यत्वात्** । तेन रसान्तरसम्भवेऽपि पार्षदप्रसिद्ध्या etc. ।
Abhi. Bhā., II, p. 341.

VYASANA, DUḤKHA AND SUKHA RASAS

The Nāṭyadarpaṇa of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra follows Abhinava, reproducing these very words of the Abhinavabhāratī but adds that though, usefulness in Puruṣārtha and Rañjanā restrict Rasas to nine, more Rasas are possible: Laulya with Gardha as its Sthāyin; Sneha with Ārdratā as its Sthāyin; Vyasana Rasa with Āsakti as its Sthāyin; Duḥkha Rasa with Arati as its Sthāyin and Sukha Rasa with Santoṣa as its Sthāyin.

सम्भवन्ति त्वपरेऽपि—यथा गर्धस्थायी लौल्यः, आर्द्रतास्थायी स्नेहः, आसक्तिस्थायि व्यसनम्, अरतिस्थायि दुःखम्, सन्तोषस्थायि सुखमित्यादि ।

G. O. S. edn., p. 163.

According to the view that accepts the Vyabhicārins also as Rasas, the names Sthāyin and Vybhicārin are not fixed names of two sets, but rather names of stages. A Sthāyin may be a Vyābhicārin and a Vyabhicārin may become a Sthāyin. Abhinava himself draws our attention to Bharata prohibiting the Vyabhicārin Jugupsā in S'ṛṅgāra. (p. 334, Abhi. Bhā.) This Jugupsa is a Sthāyin. The author of the gloss on the Vyaktiviveka says:

स्थायिनामपि व्यभिचारित्वं भवति । यथा रतेर्देवादिविषयायाः, हासस्य शृङ्गारादौ, शोकस्य विप्रलम्भशृङ्गारादौ, क्रोधस्य प्रणयकोपादौ, विस्मयस्य वीरादौ, उत्साहस्य शृङ्गारादौ, भयस्य अभिसारिकादौ, जुगुप्सायाः संसारनिन्दादौ, शमस्य कोपाभिहतस्य प्रसादोद्गमादौ ॥

T. S. S. Edn., pp. 11-12.

S'ārṅgadeva, Saṁgītaratnākara:

रत्यादयः स्थायिभावाः स्युर्भूयिष्ठविभावजाः ।
स्तोकैर्विभावैरुत्पन्नास्त एव व्यभिचारिणः ॥
रसान्तरेष्वपि तदा यथायोगं भवन्ति ते ।
यथा हि हासः शृङ्गारे रतिः शान्ते च दृश्यते ॥
वीरे क्रोधो भयं शोके जुगुप्सा च भयानके ।
उत्साहविस्मयौ सर्वरसेषु व्यभिचारिणौ ॥

Bhānudatta, Rasataraṅgiṇī, v:

स्थायिनोऽपि व्यभिचरन्ति । हासः शृङ्गारे । रतिः शान्तकरुण-हास्येषु । भयशोकौ करुणशृङ्गारयोः । क्रोधो वीरे । जुगुप्सा भयानके । उत्साहविस्मयौ सर्वरसेषु व्यभिचारिणौ ॥

Further, we find among the Vyabhicārins, Amarṣa which is only Krodha, the Sthāyin of Raudra, but in a lesser degree; Trāsa which is Bhaya, the Sthāyin of Bhayānaka; Viṣāda which is only S'oka, the Sthāyin of Karuṇa Rasa.

Bhoja is a writer who held the same view as Lollaṭa and Rudraṭa on the number of Rasas. Bhoja's theory of Rasa is a very complex problem and it has been expounded at length by the present writer in the Rasa section of his Ph. D. thesis on Bhoja's S'ṛṅgāra Prakās'a. Bhoja is a monist and a pluralist combined regarding this question of the number of Rasas. Fundamentally, Rasa is only one to him, and that is, Ahaṅkāra or S'ṛṅgāra or Abhimāna. Compared to this, even Rati-S'ṛṅgāra, Hāsya, Vīra, and the other old Rasas are unfit to be called Rasas, but are only Bhāvas; much more so the Vyabhicārins. But this is a Pāramārthika state of affairs and there is a Vyāvahārika state also in which, by

Upacāra, the name Rasa, by virtue of the immanence of Ahaṅkāra in all of them, applies to all the forty-nine Bhāvas.

Udātta and Uddhata Rasas

If we turn to Bhoja's S. K. Ā., Ch. V, we find him first mentioning only the eight old Rasas:

रतिर्हासश्च . . . . . ।
. . विस्मयश्चाष्टौ स्थायिभावाः प्रकीर्तिताः ॥ V. 14.

Then, he adds, that these Rasas have 'Vis'eṣas', which, as a matter of fact, means, additional Rasas:

शृङ्गारवीरकरुणरौद्राद्भुतभयानकाः ।
बीभत्सहास्यप्रेयांसः शान्तोदात्तोद्धता रसाः ॥ V. 164.

The additional Rasas mentioned here are the old S'ānta, the Preyas which we have already heard of and two absolutely new Rasas, Udātta and Uddhata. Dr. Abhayakumar Guha, writing on the Rasa Cult in the Caitanya Caritāmṛta, in the Asutosh Silver Jubilee Volumes, III, says on p. 375. "Another rhetorician, Bhojarāja, adds one more, *e.g.* Preman (love). Thus according to Bhojarāja, eleven Rasas in all." That is, he says, to the wellknown nine, some add Vātsalya and Bhoja, Preman, making eleven. This information is wrong. Dr. S. K. De says in Vol. II of his Poetics: "and although he (Bhoja) mentions as many as ten Rasas in his encyclopaedic S. K. Ā., including the S'ānta and Preyas . . ." This also is incorrect. As shown above, Bhoja accepts twelve Rasas in all in his S. K. Ā. There is no peculiarity about S'ānta and

Preyas[1] in Bhoja, both of which are Rasas from earlier times. The two new Rasas of Bhoja are Udātta and Uddhata Rasas. They are both explained and illustrated on p. 515 of the S. K. Ā. Mati is held as the Sthāyin of the Udātta Rasa and Garva as the Sthāyin of the Uddhata Rasa. Bhoja says that the Udātta is also called Ūrjasvin.

It is clear that Bhoja proposed these two new Rasas as a result of his realisation that each type of Hero shall be

[1] (*a*) Bhoja gives Preyas as Vatsalaprakṛti, *i.e.*, having Vātsalya as its Sthāyin, S. K. Ā., p. 514. Bhoja's illustration is however not friendship but only love for woman which will not prove Preyas as different from S'ṛṅgāra. As a matter of fact, Preyas is considered by Bhoja as the Rasa lying at the root of S'ṛṅgāra and all other types of love. Preyas is called Ahetupakṣapāta—

"रतिप्रीत्योरपि चायमेव मूलप्रकृतिरिष्यते । यदित्थमाहुः—
'अहेतुः पक्षपातो यस्तस्य नास्ति प्रतिक्रिया ।
स हि स्नेहात्मकस्तन्तुरन्तर्भूतानि सीव्यति ॥' (U. R. Carita, V. 17.)
S.K.Ā., p. 515.

The verse from the U. R. Carita quoted by Bhoja occurs in the drama to explain the inexplicable love that two persons, of whatever descriptions they may be, evince mutually on seeing each other,—called Tārāmaitraka and Cakṣūrāga. This is a purer and more basic love and rides high in the synthetic tides of Bhoja's imaginative mind. Bhoja, as can be seen in the last section of this paper, synthesises all Rasas and Bhāvas in this Preyas or Preman. Hāsya is love for Hāsa; Vīra is love for Utsāha and so on. In his S'ṛṅgāra Prakās'a, Ch. XI, Bhoja says at the very outset:

रसांस्त्विह प्रेमाणमेव आमनन्ति ।

(*b*) Dr. De and Dr. Guha evidently owe their view of the number of Rasas accepted by Bhoja to Kavikarṇapūra Gosvāmin's Alaṁkāra Kaustubha:

भोजस्तु वत्सलप्रेमभ्याम् एकादश रसानाचष्टे । p. 123.

Bhoja's synthesis of all Rasas in Preman is to be found in this writer also; of this more later. (*See* A. Kaus., pp. 147-8.)

distinguished by a Rasa which dominates his character and constitutes his individuality. Thus S'ānta is the Rasa of the Dhīras'ānta hero; Preyas of the Dhīralalita; Udātta or Ūrjasvin of the Dhīrodātta and Uddhata of Dhīroddhata. He says expressly in his S'ṛṅgāra Prakās'a :

न च अष्टावेवेति नियमः, यतः शान्तं प्रेयांसम् उद्धतम् ऊर्जस्विनं च केचिद्रसमाचक्षते । तन्मूलाश्च किल नायकानां धीरशान्त-धीरललित-धीरोद्धत-धीरोदात्तव्यपदेशः । Mad. MS., Vol. II, pp. 337-8.

Among old Sanskrit writers also, as among modern research scholars, few had a correct knowledge of what the king of Dhārā said actually. Siṁhabhūpāla is the only writer who caught sight of Bhoja's Udātta and Uddhata Rasas and criticised them in his R. A. S., pp. 168-172, T. S. S. The amonymous Sāhitya mīmāmsā (T. S. S, 114), a work largely indebted to Bhoja, also notes Bhoja's Udātta, Uddhata and Preyān and remarks that some would consider these three Rasas as included in the eight. I have dealt with this at length elsewhere.

In addition to these two new Rasas, Bhoja, like Rudraṭa, recognised all the Bhāvas as being capable of becoming Rasas. In the Vyavahāra-stage, Bhoja held all the forty-nine Bhāvas as Rasas :

एतेन रूढाहङ्कारता रसस्य पूर्वा कोटिः । रत्यादीनामेकोनपञ्चाशतोऽपि विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगात परप्रकर्षाधिगमे रसव्यपदेशार्हता रसस्यैव मध्यमावस्था । S'ṛ. Pra. Vol. II. p. 301.

रत्यादयो यदि रसास्स्युरतिप्रकर्षे
हर्षादिभिः किमपराद्धमतद्भिभिन्नैः

अस्थायिनस्त इति चेद् भयहासशोक-
क्रोधादयो वद कियच्चिरमुल्लसन्ति ॥
स्थायित्वमत्र विषयातिशयान्मतं चेत्
चिन्तादयः कुतः; उत प्रकृतेर्वशेन ।
तुल्यैव सात्मनि भवेद् ; अथ वासनायाः
सन्दीपनात् ? तदुभयत्र समानमेव ॥

S'ṛ. Pra., Intro. verses 11 and 12.

"यदप्युक्तं परप्रकर्षगामी रत्यादिभावो रस इति, तदप्यसारम् । ग्लान्यादिष्वपि तदुपपत्तेः । ग्लन्यादयोऽपि हि श्रमादिभिः परं प्रकर्षमारोप्यन्ते । न ते स्थायिन इति चेत स्थायित्वमेषाम् उत्पन्नतीव्रसंस्कारत्वम् । तीव्रसंस्कारोत्पत्तिश्च विषयातिशयात, नायकप्रकृतेश्च । प्रकृतिश्च त्रिधा—सात्त्विकी, राजसी, तामसी च । तद्वशाच्च तथाविधानुभवभावनोत्पत्तिः । ततश्चैषां स्थायित्वव्यपदेश इति ।"

"हर्षादिष्वपि विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगस्य विद्यमानत्वात" ।

ibid., Vol. II, p. 355.

"अन्ये त्वाहुः (चाहुः)—सर्व एव रत्यादयो विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगादुत्पद्यमानाः भूमानमापन्ना रसीभवन्ति । तथा हि—

रसनाद्रसत्वमेषां मधुरादीनामिवोक्तमाचार्यैः ।
निर्वेदादिष्वपि तन्निकाममस्तीति तेऽपि रसाः ॥ (Rudraṭa).

सर्वेषां च तुल्ये रसत्वे रत्यादीनामेव परप्रकर्षगामिनां शृङ्गारवीरव्यपदेश इति न घटते" । *ibid.*

Bhoja restates Rudraṭa's position with some arguments. He asks: If Rati and the other seven become Rasas, why not

Harṣa and the rest ? If it is said that Rati etc. alone become Rasas by virtue of their being Sthāyins, why are not Harṣa and others Sthāyins ? It cannot be said that all these eight and these eight only are 'permanent' and Harṣa etc. are 'fleeting'. Among these eight also, there are Bhaya, Hāsa, S'oka, Krodha etc. which are not 'permanent'. Permanance or Evanescence is not inherent in any Bhāva invariably but is born as a result of character and circumstance. Universality and the quality of being a major mood do not pertain to these eight only. Cintā is as much a major mood, in a character and in a set of conditions, as Rati. Therefore, even as Rati, Glāni (Fatigue), or Harṣa (Delight), have their own Vyabhicārins, Anubhāvas and Vibhāvas.[1] Provided the poet develops these Harṣa etc. also with their attendant emotional conditions, they also attain to Sthāyitva and Rasatva. Thus, in a later section devoted to illustration, Bhoja speaks of Ānanda Rasa with Harṣa as its Sthāyin.[2] (S. K. Ā., p. 636 and S'ṛṅgāra Prakās'a, Vol. II, p. 394.) On pp. 394-5 of his S'ṛṅgāra Prakās'a (Vol. II) and p. 627 of his S. K. Ā., he speaks, along with the Vīra and Uddhata Rasas, of the new Rasas Svātantrya, Ānanda, Pras'ama, and Pāravas'ya. On p. 399 of the S'ṛṅgāra Prakās'a (Vol. II) and 629 of his S. K. Ā., he speaks of Sādhvasa, Vilāsa, Anurāga and Saṁgama Rasas. This beats Rudraṭa who mentioned Nirvedādi only, *i.e.* all the Cittavṛttis and primarily the Vyabhicārins, as Rasas. But Bhoja extends Rasatva to Sāttvikas also, which

[1] Accordingly, in Chs. XIII-XIV, (Vol. III, Mad. MS.), Bhoja gives the Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicārins of all the forty-nine Bhāvas. According to Abhinava, only the eight or nine Sthāyins can have Vyabhicārins. Vibhāvas and Anubhāvas are granted to all.

[2] The Nātya darpaṇa, as pointed out above, points out Sukha as a Rasa with Santoṣa as its Sthāyin. Contentment, Santoṣa, is Ānanda's Tṛṣṇākṣaya and the N. D.'s Sukha is really S'ānta Rasa.

are physical manifestations. And in this respect, he is one with Namisādhu who says while commenting on the bit in Rudraṭa—'इति मन्तव्या रसास्सर्वे '—

इतिशब्दः एवंप्रकारार्थः । एवंप्रकारा अन्येऽपि भावा रतिनिर्वेद-स्तम्भादयः सर्वेऽपि रसा बोद्धव्याः ।

Though called Bhāvas, the Sāttvikas are physical manifestations. शारीरस्तु सात्त्विकभावादिः says Bhānudatta in his Rasataraṅgiṇī. But even these are Rasas, as much as any Cittavṛtti, to Bhoja. Fortunately the inanimate Uddīpana Vibhāvas like the Malayamaruta and Moonlight and the Ālambana Vibhāvas which are characters themselves are not made Rasa. To these Bhoja would be content to give the name 'Rasānvyavibhūtis'. But there seem to have been persons, before Bhoja also, who would take, as the Das'a-rūpaka points out, such subjects as Mṛgayā and Akṣa as Rasas.

From a passage in the Locana of Abhinava we understand that a period of chaos prevailed in the world of Rasas. Abhinava says that some hold the pure Vibhāva only as Rasa; some Sthāyin only; some the Vyabhicārins only; some the interplay of all these; some the story enacted itself and some all this put together.

अन्यें तु शुद्धं विभावम् , अपरे शुद्धमनुभावं, केचित्तु स्थायिमात्रम् , इतरे व्यभिचारिणम् , अन्ये तत्संयोगिनम् , एके अनुकार्यं, केचन सकलमेव समुदायं रसमाहुरित्यलं बहुना ।'' Locana, p. 69.

It is perhaps on the authority of this passage in the Locana that Jagannātha Paṇḍita says in his R. G., p. 28.

"विभावादयः त्रयः समुदिता रसः" इति कतिपयें । 'त्रिषु य एव चमत्कारी स एव रसोऽन्यथा तु त्रयोऽपि न' इति बहवः ।

'भाव्यमानो विभाव एव रसः' इति अन्ये। 'अनुभावस्तथा तथा' इतीतरे। 'व्यभिचार्येव तथा तथा परिणमति' इति केचित।"

Such a view of the concept of Rasa has been criticised by Abhinavagupta. Surely the very substratum of the Bhāvas, namely the characters, the Ālambana Vibhāvas, cannot be called Rasa. Things like Moonlight and Southern Breeze, which are Jaḍa and are conditions of Nature kindling the sentiment, Uddīpanas, cannot possibly be mental states, Cittavṛttis, and are thus not to be called Rasa. Similarly the Sāttvika. What Bhāva is tear which is a drop of water and Romāñca which is hair standing on end? While defining, explaining and illustrating the eight Sāttvikas which are also Rasas to him, Bhoja says in his S. K. Ā. (pp. 498-500) that though they become Rasas, they, being Sāttvikas, are not attended by accessory Sañcārins:

"अयं च स्तम्भः पुष्टोऽपि सात्त्विकत्वात् सदव अन्यानुयायीति नानुभावादिभिरनुबध्यते।"

"अस्यापि (रोमाञ्चस्य) सात्त्विकत्वात् अन्यानुबन्धा.या न जायन्ते।" S. K. Ā., p. 498.

What does Bhoja mean by such qualified Rasas? How can an unattended thing be considered Puṣṭa or developed? If it is still looking up to something to render itself understood (अन्यमुखप्रेक्षि), how is it leading? A mere description of Stambha cannot make an instance of Stambha Rasa. The concept of Rasa means (1) an emotional state and (2) an emotional state which is 'Pradhāna'. This 'Pradhānatva' is not a mere question of a poet nourishing a Bhāva. It means that the Bhāva is, by nature, a major mood, within which occur a number of secondary emotional states. Only such a

major state of mind can be reinforced by attendant conditions. Bhoja says Glāni can be reinforced by S'rama etc. This is not possible. When it is said that one is Glāna, fatigued, the question is at once asked, and the mind does not rest without asking this question, why is he fatigued? That is, there cannot be Vis'rānti in a minor or fleeting feeling; such a minor mood is common to more than one state of mind. One may be fatigued because of Vipralambha, because of fight in Vīra, because of yogic practice in S'ānta. But when it is said that Rāma loves Sītā, there is no more question. A Sthāyin explains a world of feelings; it is like a master with many servants; it is independent, Svatantra and Ananyamukhaprekṣī, Ananyānuyāyī and Svavis'rānta. This is the significance of the simple but effective simile of King and the followers. Abhinava clearly explains the position thus:

"अप्रधाने च वस्तुनि कस्य संविद् विश्राम्यति, तस्यैव प्रत्ययस्य प्रधानान्तरं प्रत्यनुधावतः स्वात्मनि अविश्रान्तत्वात्। अतो अप्रधानत्वं जडे **विभावानुभाववर्गे,** व्यभिचारिनिचये च संविदात्मकेऽपि नियमेन अन्यमुखप्रेक्षिणि संभवतीति तदतिरिक्तः स्थाय्येव चर्वणापात्रम्।"

Abhi. Bhā., I, p. 283.

"ये त्वेते ऋतुमाल्यादयो विभावाः **बाह्याश्च बाष्पप्रभृतयो अनुभावाः** ते न भावशब्देन व्यपदेश्याः।"

"भावशब्देन तावत् चित्तवृत्तिविशेषा एव विवक्षिताः।"

ibid., Ch. VII, p. 343.

As regards the criticism that some among the accepted Sthāyins of old are less permanent, Abhinava accepts that there does exist a graded Prādhānya among them. He accepts also that sometimes, the Sthāyins become Vyabhicārins but Vyabhicārins do not become Rasas. Vyabhicārins

are always Paratantra.[1] It cannot be contended that all Bhāvas are equally relevant to the Puruṣārthas. The point in the argument of Caturvargopayoga is this: There are any number of things that man aspires for and works to get; but all these fall under the four heads of Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. Similarly, though any feeling of man, as such, cannot but be related to his activity towards Caturvargaprāpti, there is a classification and grouping possible among them, according to which we arrive at a few dominant heads, under which the rest can be brought. The argument of 'Rañjanādhikya' means this: Though there is Āsvādyatva in everything in poetry and drama, it is only some mental conditions that can be handled as leading themes; how can Glāni be worked at as the Rasa of a drama and who will relish it?

Jagannātha paṇḍita adopts a peculiar attitude towards this question. He raises the problem by pointing out Bhakti as an additional Rasa. As love for God, an Anurāga, it cannot be brought under S'ānta, since S'ānta implies absence of any Rāga. He replies that all Rati except the Rati between man and woman is only a Bhāva and can never become a Rasa. If it is argued that Bhagavad Rati can be taken as the

[1] To Abhinava, the Vyabhicārins are always Paratantra; to Bhoja, they are Svatantra and Paratantra according as they are Rasa or Bhāva. There is a writer, later than Vidyānātha, named Veṅkatanārāyaṇa dikṣita, of the Āndhrades'a, who seems to follow the view of writers like Bhoja. For he says that Vyabhicārins are of two kinds, Svatantra and Paratantra; when they go to highten another, they are the latter; they are the former when they do not have to heighten another.

परतन्त्राः स्वतन्त्राश्च द्विविधा व्यभिचारिणः ।
परपोषकतां प्राप्ताः परतन्त्रा इतीरिताः ।
तदभावे स्वतन्त्राः स्युः भावा इति च ते स्मृताः ॥ Mad. MS., pp. 112-3.

He however does not explain his position further.

Sthāyi-Rati and the Strīpum-Rati be relegated to the Bhāva-class, another will propose Rati for children as a Sthāyin and a third will ask why Jugupsā and S'oka cannot be put down as Vyabhicārins instead of being called Sthāyins. The whole system of Bharata will then have to be overhauled and this is far from desirable! Bharata alone is the guide and authority to decide which Bhāva is Sthāyin and which Vyabhicārin.

"न चासौ शान्तरसेऽन्तर्भावमर्हति । अनुरागस्य वैराग्यविरुद्धत्वात् । उच्यते—भक्तेः देवादिविषयरतित्वेन भावान्तर्गततया रसत्वानुपपत्तेः । . . . . भरतादिमुनिवचनानामेव रसभावत्वादिव्यवस्थापकत्वेन, स्वातन्त्र्यायोगात् । अन्यथा पुत्रादिविषयाया अपि रतेः स्थायिभावत्वं कुतो न स्यात् ? न स्याद्वा कुतः शुद्धभावत्वं जुगुप्साशोकादीनाम् , इत्यखिल-दर्शनव्याकुली स्यात् । रसानां नवत्वगणना च मुनिवचननियन्त्रिता भज्येत, इति यथाशास्त्रमेव ज्यायः ।" R. G. pp. 45-6.

Bhakti and Madhura Rasa

It was pointed out previously how Daṇḍin illustrated Preyas by two instances of devotion to God, Bhakti. It is natural that, in this land, this sentiment of devotion should have been soon accepted as a Rasa. But Abhinava and others proposed to bring it under S'ānta. S'ānta is the Rasa relating to the final Puruṣārtha, Mokṣa; and many are the paths leading to Mokṣa. The three paths of Bakti, Karman and Jñāna are wellknown. It may be that Bhakti is in some cases an Aṅga of the S'ānta developed on lines of Jñāna but the advocates of Bhakti held it to be supreme by itself. They made Jñāna and Karman its aids; the release, Mokṣa, from everything which the Jñānin wanted, the Bhakta did not favour. He wanted that he should permanently be loving God.

Just as Vīra Rasa has the four varieties, Dāna etc., this Bhakti also has the varieties of Madhura or S'ṛṅgāra or Ujjvala, *i.e*, love as in the case of the Gopīs towards Kṛṣṇa, Sakhya as in the case of Arjuna, Vātsalya as in the case of Devakī, Yas'odā, Vasudeva and Nanda, Dāsya or servitude as in the case of other devotees. The elaboration of Bhakti Rasa on these lines is the special contribution of the rhetoricians of Bengal who followed the school of Caitanya. Rūpa Gosvāmin's two works, the Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu and the Ujjvalanīlamaṇi deal with this Bhakti Rasa at very great length. Dr. Abhayakumar Guha has dealt with this subject in an article on the Rasa Cult in the Caitanyacaritrāmṛta in the Asutosh Mukerjee Siver Jubilee Volumes (III) and Dr. S. K. De's complete account of 'the Bhakti-Rasa S'āstra of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism' in the IHQ (Vol. VIII) for 1932, removes the need for any further contribution on this subject.

These Vaiṣṇava Ālaṁkārikas accept the eight Rasas of Bharata; accept the S'ānta; accept the Vātsalya; accept the 'Sneha-prakṛtiḥ Preyān' or the 'Ārdratā-sthāyikaḥ Snehaḥ' as Sakhya and add only one absolutely new Rasa-concept, namely Dāsya. Thus they speak of twelve Rasas but they give a new orientation to the whole scheme, wherein lies the speciality of their school. The old S'ṛṅgāra becomes the chief Rasa; it is Rati for their God; it is also called Madhura and Ujjvala. Along with this Madhura, there are four others which are primary; they are S'ānta, Dāsya, Sakhya and Vātsalya. These five are called the five Mukhya Bhakti Rasas. The rest, the seven (Hāsya, Adbhuta, Vīra, Karuṇa, Bībhatsa, Bhayānaka and Raudra), are secondary, the Gauṇa Bhakti Rasas. The primary Bhakti Rasas numbering five are the five forms of Bhakti; the seven secondary Rasas are

more or less Vyabhicārins for the five primary Rasas, for they are Rasas only when they involve Kṛṣṇa-rati.

शान्त दास्य (सख्य) मधुर रस नाम
कृष्ण भक्ति रस मध्ये ए पञ्च प्रधान ।
हास्याद्भुतवीरकरुणबीभत्सभयरौद्र
पञ्च विध भक्ते गौण सप्त रस हय ।
पञ्च रसस्थायी व्यापी रहे भक्तनते
सप्त गौण आगन्तुक पा इये कारणे ॥

(Quoted by Dr. A. K. Guha in the article ref. to above.)

According to the table given by Dr. De in his article (p. 666), Dāsya is called Prīta (rendered as Faithfulness) and Sakhya is called Preyas (rendered as Friendship).

Kavikarṇapūra's Alaṁkāra Kaustubha is a regular Alaṁkāra treatise but it introduces some ideas of these Vaiṣṇava Ālaṁkārikas also. Kavikarṇapūra does not give us the classification into Mukhya and Gauṇa Rasa, and we miss also Dāsya in his work. He accepts the eight Rasas of Bharata, the S'ānta and the Vātsalya. To these ten he adds two more, Preman and Bhakti. Preman is the name he gives to the Madhura Rasa, the divine S'ṛṅgāra between Kṛṣṇa and the Gopīs. He considers Cittadrava as its Sthāyin. According to him, this love is not S'ṛṅgāra. He also records the view of some who hold S'ṛṅgāra as the Rasa between Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa and says that, in that case, Preman will be the Aṅga of that S'ṛṅgāra. But, according to himself, Preman is the Aṅgin; S'ṛṅgāra its Aṅga. This Preman, Kavikarṇapūra considers as Love Supreme within which every other Rasa comes.

"अथ प्रेमरसः . . . अत्र चित्तद्रवः स्थायी । प्रेमरसे सर्वे रसा अन्तर्भवन्तीत्यत्र महीयानेव प्रपञ्चः । ग्रन्थगौरवभयाद्दिङ्मात्रमुक्तम् ।

केषाञ्चिन्मते श्रीराधाकृष्णयोः शृङ्गार एव रसः । तन्मतेऽप्येतदुदाहरणं नासङ्गतम् । शृङ्गारोऽङ्गी प्रेम अङ्गम्, अङ्गस्यापि कंचिदुद्रिक्तता । वयं तु प्रेमाङ्गी, शृङ्गारोऽङ्गमिति विशेषः । तथा च—

उन्मज्जन्ति निमज्जन्ति प्रेम्ण्यखण्डरसत्वतः ।
सर्वे रसाश्च भावाश्च तरङ्गा इव वारिधौ ॥ A. Kau., p. 148.

This view of Preman will make it the basic Love, which Bhoja also says, lies at the root, as Mūlaprakṛti, of Rati and Prīti.

The Vāghela King Viśvanāthasiṁha, a great devotee of Rāma and the author of a number of works on Rāma, (A. D. 1853-4) treats of Bhagavad Bhakti as a Rasa at the end of his treatise Sarvasiddhānta. *Vide* Rajendralal Mitra, Notices of MSS., Vol VII, p. 100. No. 2329. It would be interesting to compare his elaboration of this subject with that of the Bengal Vaiṣṇava Ālaṁkārikas.

Madhusūdana Sarasvatī on Bhakti Rasa

It is a well-known fact that Madhusūdana-sarasvatī, the great Advaitic writer, was a great devotee of the personal God in the form of Kṛṣṇa. In this role, he has left to us a Stotra, and a treatise on devotion called Bhagavadbhaktirasāyana,[1] a work, in which the subject is approached from the point of view of the Ālaṁkārika. It expounds the Bhakti Rasa. Though this Rasa is old and has been dealt with by others, as can be seen from the foregone survey, the treatment by Madhusūdana-sarasvatī has its own peculiarities.

Generally, the Puruṣārthas are said to be four, Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. M. S. says that Puruṣārtha is

[1] Benares Edn., 1927.

really one which is bliss untainted by misery, दुःखासंस्पृष्टसुख, and that, if one speaks of four Puruṣārthas, one calls the means the end, adopting the common Upacāra (p. 5). Since devotion to God, Bhagavad-Bhakti, is one of the ways of attaining such unmixed bliss, Bhakti also is a Puruṣārtha,

अतो भगवद्भक्तियोगस्यापि दुःखासंभिन्नसुखत्वेनैव परमपुरुषार्थत्वमित्याह—‘ निरुपमसुखसंविद्रूपमस्पृष्टदुःखम् ’ इति । p. 5.

M. S. separates Jñāna and Bhakti and consequently does not include Bhakti in the fourth Puruṣārtha, Mokṣa. He bases himself on the difference in character in aspirants to spiritual salvation, which explains why some take to the path of knowledge, Jñāna, and some to the path of devotion, Bhakti. Firm minds seek the former through cultivated Nirveda, while softer minds tending to be emotional seek the latter.

ततश्च अद्रुतचित्तस्य निर्वेदपूर्वकं तत्त्वज्ञानम् । द्रुतचित्तस्य तु भगवत्कथाश्रवणादिभागवतधर्मश्रद्धापूर्विका भक्तिरिति अवधित्वेन द्वयमप्युपात्तम् । p. 2.

On the basis of certain texts in the Bhāgavata, he even says that Jñāna also becomes a means and not an end, a means to the attainment of Cittaprasāda, which is necessary for Bhakti. This makes Jñāna a Sañcārin of Bhakti.

“अत्र ‘मनो यावत् प्रसीदति’ (भा. XI. 20.) इति भक्तियोग एव ज्ञानावधिकत्वेन उक्तः ।” p. 3.[1]

[1] On p. 11 M.S. points out the difference between Bhakti and Brahmavidyā or Jñāna. The two are there for two different kinds of Adhikārins. The common man or anybody as such is a candidate for Bhakti; whereas, only he who has acquired the four

M.S. accepts two kinds of Bhakti, the means and the end, Sādhana and Phala. Even as Jñāna can be means to Bhakti, Bhakti itself can be. The Bhāgavata dharmas like S'ravaṇa and Kīrtana, which produce Cittaprasāda and Sattvas'uddhi, form Sādhana bhakti (p. 8). Bhakti itself can serve to intensify Bhakti.

The word Bhakti itself is explained by M.S. in a very original manner. All writers explain Bhakti as Rati for God. M.S. does not say this at first. According to him, Bhakti is the Citta taking the form of the Lord. The Citta or Antaḥkaraṇa takes the form of the object it comes into contract with; भगवदाकारता is Bhakti.

"भजनम् अन्तःकरणस्य भगवदाकारतारूपं भक्तिः ।
द्रुतस्य भगवद्धर्माद्धारावाहिकतां गता ।
सर्वेशो मनसो वृत्तिर्भक्तिरित्यभिधीयते ॥ I, 3.

. . . या सर्वेशविषया वृत्तिः भगवदाकारतेत्यर्थः ; तदाकारतैव हि सर्वत्र वृत्तिशब्दोऽस्माकं दर्शने ; अतस्सा भक्तिरित्यभिधीयते ।" p. 13.

By Karaṇa Vyutpatti, Bhakti means the Sādhanas also.

"भज्यते सेव्यते भगवदाकारम् अन्तःकरणं क्रियते अनया' इति करणव्युत्पत्त्या भक्तिशब्देन श्रवणकीर्तनादि साधनमभिधीयते ।" p. 8.

Thus the word Bhakti would apply to the Uddīpanas and the Anubhāvas also.

Sādhanas is eligible for Brahmavidyā. In form also, the two differ; Bhakti is a Savikalpaka-cittavṛtti and Brahmavidyā is a Nirvikalpaka-cittavṛtti. In the former, the mind takes the form of God.

On p. 6, he points out to the critics who would not give Bhakti such a supreme and independent status of Puruṣārtha, that they should accept Bhakti as a Puruṣārtha, at least as forming part of the first or the fourth, Dharma or Mokṣa.

M.S. explains all details, Vibhāvas etc., according to his view. The Ālambana Vibhāva is of course the Lord (p. 6); Tulasī, Candana etc. are the Uddīpana vibhāvas; Anubhāvas are tears of joy or closing of eyes and the like. Regarding the Sthāyin, the older writers give Rati but Madhusūdana holds the Citta being of the form of the Lord, Bhagavadākāratā, as the Sthāyin. This Cittavṛtti develops into the Rasa of ineffable bliss.

"—सकलविषयविमुखमनसः महाभागस्य कस्यचित् भगवद्गुणगरिमग्रन्थनरूपग्रन्थश्रवणजनितद्रुतिरूपायां मनोवृत्तौ सर्वसाधनफलभूतायां **गृहीतभगवदाकारायां** विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगेन रसरूपतया विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद्रसनिष्पत्तिः' इति ।

"विभावो द्विविधः—आलम्बनविभावः उद्दीपनविभावश्च । तत्र आलम्बनविभावो भगवान्, उद्दीपनविभावः तुलसीचन्दनादिः, अनुभावो नेत्रविक्रियादिः । व्यभिचारिणो भावाः निर्वेदादयः ; **व्यक्तीभवद्भगवदाकारतारूपरसाख्यः स्थायिभावः** परमानन्दसाक्षात्कारात्मकः प्रादुर्भवति ; स एव भक्तियोग इति ; तं परमं निरतिशयं पुरुषार्थं वदन्ति रसज्ञाः ।" p. 4.

It must be noted here that, though M.S. distinguishes S'ānta and Bhakti as essentially different, he still gives Nirveda or सकलविषयविमुखमनस्कता (Vairāgya) as a condition precedent even to the Uddīpana vibhāva. This would however make S'ānta an Aṅga. Though M.S. gives his Sthāyin for Bhakti as Bhagavadākāracittavṛtti, there does not seem to be any great difference between this and Bhagavad-Rati. For he holds that the result of this Cittavṛtti, its Phala, is intense love for God. भगवद्विषयकप्रेमप्रकर्षो भक्तिफलम् । p. 11. On p. 16, he says that this molten state of the mind is called Praṇaya, Anurāga, Sneha etc., all names of Rati.

इयमेव द्रवावस्था प्रणयानुरागस्नेहादिशब्दैरपि सङ्कीर्त्यते । p. 16.

According to M. S., the Ālambana of Bhakti is God; the Rasa realised, Paramānanda, is God; and the Sthāyin, the mind which has taken God's form, is also God. How is this explained? M.S. says that God the Ālambana is independent and is the Bimba of which the Sthāyin in us is the Pratibimba. The form of God is ineffable bliss.

भगवान् परमानन्दस्वरूपः स्वयमेव हि ।
मनोगतस्तदाकाररसतामेति पुष्कलम् ॥ I. 10, p. 18.

बिम्बमेव ह्युपाधिनिष्ठत्वेन प्रतीयमानं प्रतिबिम्बमित्युच्यते । परमानन्दश्च भगवान् मनसि प्रतिबिम्बितः स्थायिभावतामासाद्य रसतामापादयतीति भक्तिरसस्य परमानन्दरूपत्वं निर्विवादम् । नाप्यालम्बनविभावस्थायिभावयोरैक्यम्, बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावत्वेन भेदस्य व्यवहारसिद्धत्वात्, ईशजीवयोरिव ।" p. 18.

M. S. then recognises that the following Bhāvas can become Sthāyins and Rasas. 1. Kāma becoming Sambhoga and Vipralambha; 2. Krodha becoming Dveṣa as in S'is'upāla and Kaṁsa; 3. Bhaya; 4. Sneha (Dāsya, Sakhya, Vātsalya, and Preyas); 5. Harṣa becoming love for Kṛṣṇa; 6. Hāsa; 7. Vismaya; 8. Utsāha (Dayā, Dāna and Dharma); 9. S'oka; 10. Jugupsā; and 11. S'ama (II, 25-26). Of these, Dharmavīra, Dayāvīra, Bībhatsa and S'ama are not part of Bhakti Rasa (II, 27-28). Similarly Dveṣa born of Īrṣyā and Bhaya are not part of Bhakti (II, 29). So also Raudra and Bhayānaka are never Aṅgas of Bhakti (II, 30). The rest form part of Bhakti (II, 31-33). As pointed out already, M. S. is of opinion that S'ānta Rasa and Mokṣa Puruṣārtha are for 'Adrutacittas' and that both differ from Bhakti which is a separate Puruṣārtha. Hence, he excludes S'ānta from Bhakti. But as can be seen in the earlier section, the Bhakti Rasa scheme of Rūpa and others admit S'ānta in Bhakti. This, the author of the gloss on M.S. also points out. M.S. rules out of the scope of Bhakti, Dharma-Vīra and Dayā-Vīra because their Ālambanas differ; Raudra and Bhaya are against love and Dveṣa cannot produce any Druti.

Those who did not accept Bhakti as a separate Rasa considered it as a Bhāva, a variety of Rati, the object of which was God. देवादिविषया रतिः. To these writers, M.S. replies that this Bhāva-Rati described as 'Devādiviṣayā' refers to Rati for the gods like Indra and others. Rati for the one supreme God is a Rasa.

रतिर्देवादिविषया व्यभिचारी तथोर्जितः ।
भावः प्रोक्तो रसो नेति यदुक्तं रसकोविदैः ॥
देवान्तरेषु जीवत्वात् परानन्दाप्रकाशनात् ।
तद्योज्यम्; परमानन्दरूपे न परमात्मनि ॥ II, 75-76.

Bhakti Rasa is the real Rasa; since here it is that one has the ineffable bliss that is not tainted by even a grain of sorrow. S'ṛṅgāra and other Rasas cannot mean this bliss and are inferior; they are like glow-worms; Bhakti is the very Sun.

कान्तादिविषया वा ये रसाद्यास्तत्र नेदृशम् ।
रसत्वं पुष्यते पूर्णसुखास्पर्शित्वकारणात् ॥
परिपूर्णरसा क्षुद्ररसेभ्यो भगवद्रतिः ।
खद्योतेभ्य इवादित्यप्रभेव बलवत्तरा ॥ II, 77-78.

THE MĀYĀ RASA

The advent of S'ānta latterly gave rise to another controversial Rasa called Māyā. Just as there is the possibility of depicting the S'ānta Rasa with the psychological, religious and metaphysical concepts like Jñāna, Bhakti, S'ama, Dama, Santuṣṭi etc., there is also the possibility of depicting the Māyā Rasa by showing the Jīvātman rolling in Saṁsāra as a result of Mithyājñāna or Avidyā, with characters Kāma, Krodha, Lobha and the like. Even as S'ānta is the Rasa of the state called Nivṛtti, Māyā is the Rasa of the state called Pravṛtti. In a philosophical drama, the Rasa from which the hero escapes into the S'ānta, will be Māyā. The Rasataraṅgiṇī of Bhānudatta puts it forward thus :

चित्तवृत्तिः द्विधा—प्रवृत्तिर्निवृत्तिश्च । निवृत्तौ यथा शान्तरसः, तथा प्रवृत्तौ मायारस इति प्रतिभाति । Ch. VII.

He points out there how this Māyā cannot be identical with or included in Rati etc., all of which come within its fold. Rati and the seven other Sthāyins become the Vyabhicārins of this Rasa.

किन्तु विद्युद् इव रतिहासशोकक्रोधोत्साहभयजुगुप्साविस्मयास्तत्र उत्पद्यन्ते विलीयन्ते च । तेन तत्र व्यभिचारिभावा इति ।

The Sthāyin of this Rasa is Mithyājñāna.

लक्षणं च प्रबुद्धमिथ्याज्ञानवासना माया रसः । मिथ्याज्ञानमस्य स्थायिभावः । विभावाः सांसारिकभोगार्जकधर्माधर्माः । अनुभावाः पुत्रकलत्रविजयसाम्राज्यादयः ।

The Mandāramaranda-campū follows the Rasataraṅgiṇī and describes the Māyā-Rasa of Pravṛtti as well as the S'ānta Rasa of Nivṛtti. K. M. 35, p. 106.

Cirañjīvibhaṭṭācārya cites the Rasataraṅgiṇī on Māyā Rasa and criticises it :

अत्रेदं चिन्त्यं—मायाया अनादित्वेन अजन्यत्वात् रसत्वासंभवः । रसास्तु सर्वे जन्या एव । कथं वा कथयेत् मिथ्याज्ञानादिः मायायाः कारणमिति, शास्त्रविरुद्धत्वात् । वस्तुतस्तु आलङ्कारिकाणां मते रसो नित्यः आनन्दरूपः । अतोऽस्य ब्रह्मस्वरूपत्वेन मायाया रसत्वासंभवः । माया हि तुच्छा विनाशशालिनी ब्रह्मभिन्नैवेति दिक् । अत एव प्राचीनसंप्रदायिकैरपि नवैव रसाः कथिताः ।"

Kāvyavilāsa, Sarasvatī Bhavan Studies, XVI, p. 10.

This scholastic criticism, going into some of the features of the concept of Māyā as accepted in Metaphysics, does not meet the question properly. If it is argued that Rasa is 'Nitya', 'Ānandarūpa' and hence of the form of the Brahman, and consequently Māyā which is different from Brahman cannot be a Rasa, how does the author propose to explain S'ṛṅgāra etc. as Rasas? They all come under Māyā. If a portrayal of Bībhatsa, Bhayānaka and Raudra can be Rasa, why not Māyā? One objection that can be considered is however not mentioned by the critic of the Māyā-Rasa and it is this: As an opposite of the S'ānta Rasa, a Māyā-Rasa is no doubt present; but it is not a unitary Rasa. It is made up of S'ṛṅgāra and the seven other Rasas. Any given specimen presenting a mundane activity can be called by one of the eight names, S'ṛṅgāra etc. It is not necessary to have a separate Rasa as Māyā which is only the common name of all the eight mundane Rasas of Pravṛtti. Suppose, in a

metaphysical play, Pravṛtti and Nivṛtti are portrayed; under the former Kāma, Krodha etc. will be portrayed as developing into S'ṛṅgāra, Raudra and other Rasas. To us who see it with unenlightened minds, the several parts will appeal as S'ṛṅgāra, Raudra and so on; we will never realise them as Māyā; if we realise, we shall be sitting along with the chosen few, the Jñānins who alone see Māyā in all those Rasas; and to them, this Māyā will not produce Cittasaṁvāda or Rasāsvāda; only the opposite S'ānta will produce that in them. Therefore, practically speaking, there is no necessity for a Māyā-Rasa.

THE KĀRPAṆYA RASA

Along with the Laulya, which Abhinava had already mentioned, Bhānudatta examines if Kārpaṇya can be a Rasa. He mentions Spṛhā as its Sthāyin. The argument for rejecting this is the same as that used by Abhinava for rejecting Laulya. Even as a development of Laulya can only become Hāsya, development of Kārpaṇya also will become Hāsya.

THE VRĪḌANAKA RASA

The Anuyōgadvāra Sūtra of the Jains, which I mentioned previously in the section on the S'ānta Rasa, gives nine Kāvya-rasas, in which list, Bhayānaka is omitted and in its place is found a new Rasa called Vrīḍanaka, which can be rendered as 'Modesty'. (Āgomodaya Samiti Series Edn. with Maladhāri Hemacandra's Skt. gloss, p. 134.)

णव कव्व रसा पण्णत्ता, तं जहा—

वीरो सिंगारो अब्भुओ अ रोद्दो अ होइ बोद्धव्वो ।
वेलणओ बीभच्छो हासो कलुणो पसंतो अ ॥

The commentary of Maladhāri Hemacandra[1] explains that Vrīḍanaka is the Rasa of Bashfulness, that some give in its place Bhayānaka as a Rasa and that this Bhayānaka is included in Raudra and hence not mentioned separately.

"व्रीडयति लज्जामुत्पादयति लज्जनीयवस्तुदर्शनादिप्रभवो मनोव्यलीकतादिस्वरूपो व्रीडनकः । अस्य स्थाने भयजनकसङ्ग्रामादिवस्तुदर्शनादिप्रभवः भयानको रसः पठ्यतेऽन्यत्र । स चेह रौद्ररसान्तर्भावविवक्षणात् पृथङ् नोक्तः ।"

In defining, however, the text gives a verse in which we see Bhayānaka instead of Raudra, to explain which the commentator says that the text describes not Raudra as such, but describes it through its effect, Bhaya. The Lakṣaṇas'loka is—

भयजननरूपशब्दान्धकारचिन्ताकथासमुत्पन्नः ।
संमोहसंभ्रमविषादमरणलिङ्गो रसो रौद्रः ॥ (छाया)

The illustration is however for Raudra proper:

भ्रुकुटीविडम्बितमुख सन्दष्टोष्ठ इत आकीर्णरुधिर ।
हंसि पशुं असुरनिभ भीमरसित अतिरौद्र रौद्रोऽसि ॥

The commentator explains that though the Lakṣaṇas'loka means only the Bhayānaka Rasa, it has to be taken as referring to the cause of Bhayānaka, Raudra also.

[1] The commentator's date is the end of the 11th cent. and early part of the 12th. He wrote his Jīvasamāsa in 1107 A.D. and Bhavabhāvanā in 1113 A.D. (Winternitz. Hist. Ind. Lit. Eng. Tran. II, p. 589.) He is different from the author of the Kāvyānus'āsana.

"ननु भयजनकरूपादिभ्यः समुत्पन्नः संमोहादिलिङ्गश्च भयानक एव भवति, कथमस्य रौद्रत्वम्; किन्तु पिशाचादिरौद्रवस्तुभ्यो जातत्वात् रौद्रत्वमस्य विवक्षितमित्यदोषः। . . . रौद्रो रसः, सोऽप्युपलक्षणत्वादत्रैव द्रष्टव्यः, अन्यथा च निरास्पद एव स्यात्। अत एव रौद्रपरिणामवत्पुरुषचेष्टाप्रतिपादकमेव उदाहरणं दर्शयिष्यति। भीतचेष्टाप्रतिपादकं तु तत् स्वत एव अभ्यूह्यमित्यलं प्रसङ्गेन।"

If the number of Rasas is to be reduced by omitting the Rasas which are produced by other Rasas or the Rasas which are the causes of other Rasas, we shall arrive at four Rasas, proceeding on the basis of Bharata's indication of the Kāraṇa-kārya-bhāva existing among the eight Rasas, शृङ्गाराद्धि भवेद्धास्यः etc. Such a process of reducing the number is illogical. There is no reason why the causal Rasa should be retained and the effected Rasa dismissed and why it should not be *vice versa*.

Coming to the Vrīḍanaka Rasa, the definition and illustration are as follows :

विनयोपचारगुह्यगुरुदारमर्यादाव्यतिक्रमोत्पन्नः।
व्रीडनको नाम रसो लज्जाशङ्काकरणलिङ्गः॥

यथा—

किं लौकिककरणीयात् लज्जनीयतरमिति लज्जितास्मि।
विवाहे गुरुजनो परिवन्दते वधूनिवसनम्॥ (छाया)

According to the gloss, this is a verse addressed by a would-be bride to her maid. The reference in it is to a provincial marriage custom according to which, elderly women and men, including the father-in-law and the mother-in-law, pay their respects to the Sārī and the person of the bride after the nuptial night. The bride is taken round and elders revere her for her chastity. The thought of the elders revering her produces shame in the bride's heart.

This however is a mere Vyabhicārin and hardly a Rasa. Vrīḍā of the same description is given by Bharata as one of the thirty-three Vyabhicārins.

VII

The Varieties of the Same Rasa

The first Rasa S'ṛṅgāra has two phases, Sambhoga and Vipralambha, the two Adhiṣṭhānas, as Bharata says, of S'ṛṅgāra. There is a peculiar view in this connection propounded by king Haripāladeva, whom I have already mentioned in the section on the S'ānta Rasa, as holding two Rasas called the S'ānta and the Brāhma. Haripāla accepts thirteen Rasas: the eight of Bharata, S'ānta and Vātsalya and three new Rasas, Sambhoga, Vipralambha and Brāhma. The peculiarity of the Brāhma-Rasa and its difference from the S'ānta have already been explained.

शृङ्गारो हास्यनामा च बीभत्सः करुणस्तथा ।
वीरो भयानकाह्वानो रौद्राख्योऽद्भुतसंज्ञकः ॥
शान्तो ब्राह्माभिधः पश्चाद् वात्सल्याख्यमतः परम् ।
संभोगो विप्रलम्भः स्यात् रसास्त्वेते त्रयोदश ॥ p. 16.

Haripāla has three different Rasas, S'ṛṅgāra, Sambhoga and Vipralambha. He considers them separate, since, according to him, their characters differ essentially. He thus argues his case against the ancients:

संभोगो विप्रलम्भश्च ब्राह्मश्चेति त्रयो रसाः ।
अतिरिक्ता उदीर्यन्ते हरिपालमहीभुजा ॥

तत्रेयं वासना (?) पूर्वैः संभोगो विप्रलम्भकः ।
शृङ्गारस्यैव भेदौ द्वौ कथितौ—तदसाम्प्रतम् ॥
अनित्यस्तत्र शृङ्गारः क(का)चित्को दृश्यते यतः ।
पशुपक्षिमृगाद्येषु यतश्च न विलोक्यते ॥
सर्वजन्तुषु दृश्यत्वात् संभोगस्यास्ति नित्यता ।
अतोऽभ्यधायि संभोगो रसः शृङ्गारकः(तः) पृथक् ॥
उज्ज्वलः शुचिरित्युक्तः शृङ्गारो हर्षवर्धनः ।
मलिनो दुःखकारी च विप्रलम्भोऽप्रियावहः ॥
अतः शृङ्गारतो भिन्नो विप्रलम्भ उदाहृतः ।
भयानकस्य वीरस्य जन्यस्य जनकस्य च ।
यो भेदो विप्रलम्भस्य संभोगस्य च स स्मृतः ॥ p. 8.

S'ṛṅgāra has always been considered as Ujjvala and S'uci, a Rasa of men of cultivated taste and of sophisticated persons, the Uttamaprakṛtis. Therefore, in course of time, S'uci and Ujjvala became synonyms of S'ṛṅgāra. In an unsophisticated rustic, there is S'ṛṅgāra but only in a way. The ancients also consider that love in birds and beasts is not Rasa, but only its semblance, Rasābhāsa. Therefore, love as understood by the word S'ṛṅgāra is Anitya and Kvācitka, being present only in high class individuals. But love of a kind which is the joy a pair derives mutually is present in all living beings, rustics, birds and beasts. This love need not be called S'ṛṅgārābhāsa, it may be separated into a distinct Rasa and called Sambhoga.

More striking is Haripāla's view regarding Vipralambha. Since both S'ṛṅgāra and Sambhoga are of a pleasurable nature, and Vipralambha is essentially of a painful nature, the latter is a separate Rasa. If S'ṛṅgāra is S'uci and Ujjvala,

Vipralambha is 'Malina'. Vipralambha may be due to S'ṛṅgāra or Sambhoga. This cause-effect relationship between S'ṛṅgāra and Vipralambha is not proof of their essential identity. The two differ as much as Vīra and Bhayānaka, of which the former produces the latter.

If love among higher classes is different from rustic love and love among birds and animals, equally do the separations, Vipralambhas, in the two cases differ. Strictly speaking, Haripāla should have two Rasas for Love in separation.

Haripāla gives Āhlāda as the Sthāyin of S'ṛṅgāra, Rati of Sambhoga and Arati of Vipralambha.

आह्लादः प्रथमं . . . . .

. . . .

. . . . प्रीत्यरती तथा ।

प्रत्येकं स्थायिनो भावाः क्रमात् प्रत्येकमीरिताः ॥ p. 17.

The ancients were not unaware of the painfulness of Vipralambha, but they did not consider it, on this score, as a separate Rasa. Autsukya or longing is at the root of Vipralambha. This longing is only a kind of Rati. Arati can only be an intermediate state in the ten Avasthās of love and it is not the basic state of mind that persists throughout Vipralambha. The slender line of Rati runs through the state of Vipralambha; and if this Rati is not accepted in Vipralambha, as its Sthāyin, there can be no difference between Vipralambha and Karuṇa. The Rasakalikā of Rudrabhaṭṭa also opines that Rati is not of the form of happiness, since Vipralambha is far from being pleasurable.

आनन्दात्मकत्वं रतेः कैश्चिदुक्तम्, तच्चिन्त्यम् । विप्रयोगादेः आनन्दात्मकत्वस्य अयोगात् । Mad. MS., p. 7.

The Rasakalikā however does not separate Vipralambha as a distinct Rasa, but takes it, as all do, as a phase of S'ṛṅgāra only. It agrees with Haripāla in finding Vipralambha as standing in the way of accepting Rati to be of the nature of pleasure. Rati will thus be, according to the Rasakalikā, a state of pleasure as well as pain. Viprayoga, though apparently and immediately painful, is ultimately a state of pleasure. The very life of Rati is a certain longing; and this exists in Sambhoga as well as in Vipralambha. That it constitutes the life of Rati is seen from what Kālidāsa and Māyurāja say: रतिमुभयप्रार्थना कुरुते (S'ākuntala) and प्रेमासमाप्तोत्सवम् (Tāpasavatsarāja). Therefore, Vipralambha is an aspect of S'ṛṅgāra only, and of Vipralambha also, Rati is the Sthāyin.

"विप्रलम्भे रतिरेव स्थायी . . . विप्रकर्षेऽपि रतेः स्वतस्सिद्धत्वात् ।"

A. Kau., Kavikarṇapūra.

To match its opinion that Rati is not unmixed pleasure, the Rasakalikā says that Rasa itself is of the nature of both pleasure and pain; but of this more in a further section.

To return to Haripāla's Sambhoga Rasa, he postulated this for the Love of those who are not Uttamaprakṛtis. The love of birds and beasts described so largely in the Kāvyas which was being known by the term Rasa-ābhāsa, comes under Haripāla's Sambhoga Rasa. Vidyādhara, the author of the Ekāvalī, refuses to recognise that the love of birds and beasts is Rasābhāsa. He says that their love also is Rasa. If it is said that the birds and beasts do not consciously enjoy or enjoy in such a manner as cultivated men and women do, such knowledge and cultivated taste, Vidyādhara says, is irrelevant. Why should the subject know what it is enjoying

or how it enjoys, provided it enjoys ? Kumārasvāmin cites this view of Vidyādhara in his commentary on the Pratāparudrīya :

‘ अत्र तिरश्चोः पारावतयोः कलाकौशलाभावेन तदीयशृङ्गारस्य विभावादिपरिपूर्त्यभावात् आभासत्वं द्रष्टव्यम्[1] । रस एवायं नाभास इति केचित् । तदुक्तं **विद्याधरेण**—‘ विभावादिसंभवो हि रसं प्रति प्रयोजकः, न विभावादिज्ञानम् । ततश्च तिरश्चामस्त्येव रसः । ’ p. 21, Bālamanoramā Edn.

Earlier than Kumārasvāmin, S'iṅgabhūpāla noticed this view of Vidyādhara, and as a staunch follower of the accepted tradition, criticised it. The discussion in his R. A. S. is too long to be quoted in full. (T. S. S. Edn., pp. 206-9.) Vidyādhara's view is thus stated :

‘ अपरे तु रसाभासं तिर्यक्षु प्रचक्षते । तत् न परीक्षाक्षमम् । तेष्वपि भावादिसंभवात् । विभावादिज्ञानशून्यास्तिर्यञ्चः न भाजनं भवितुमर्हन्ति रसस्येति चेत् न । मनुष्येष्वपि केषुचित् तथाभूतेषु रसविषयाभासप्रसङ्गात् । अत्र विभावादिसंभवोऽपि रसं प्रति प्रयोजकः । न विभावादिज्ञानम् । ततश्च तिरश्चामस्त्येव रसः । ’

The criticism of S'iṅgabhūpāla is that S'ṛṅgāra is essentially a Rasa of subjects, Ālambanas, who are S'uci and Ujjvala ; it is not enough if, according to their own conditions, birds and beasts do have a consciousness of their love and its art ; it is a question of Aucitya. How can a human being who alone is Sāmājika for poetry and drama, have Citta-saṁvāda in such cases ? The terms Vibhāva etc. do not apply in the case of the love among birds and beasts ; the

[1] That love among birds and beasts has less of art and is less poetic, may not be accepted at all by the biologists.

emotional conditions there are called only Kāraṇa, Kārya etc. Says S'iṅgabhūpāla :

“ अथ स्वजातियोग्यधर्मैः करिणां करिणीं प्रति विभावत्वं इति चेत् न । तस्यां कक्ष्यायां करिणां करिणीं प्रति कारणत्वम्, न पुनः विभावत्वम् । ”

किञ्च जातियोग्यैर्धर्मैः वस्तुनो न विभावत्वम्, अपि तु भावकचित्तोल्लासहेतुभी रतिविशिष्टैरेव ।

“ किञ्च विभावज्ञानं नाम औचित्यविवेकः, तेन शून्याः तिर्यञ्चो न विभावतां यान्ति । . . विवेकरहितजनोपलक्षणम्लेच्छगतस्य रसस्य आभासत्वे स्वेष्टावाप्तेः ॥ ” R. A. S., pp. 206-7.

Consistent with this argument, S'iṅgabhūpāla says that Anaucitya is the only cause of a Rasa becoming its Ābhāsa ; that this Anaucitya is of two kinds, Asatyatva and Ayogyatva ; and that in trees and other aspects of nature which are described in love-images, the Rasa is Ābhāsa by reason of ‘ Asatyatva ’ and in rustics, low people, and birds and beasts, the Rasa is Ābhāsa by reason of ‘ Ayogyatva. ’

आभासता भवेदेषामनौचित्यप्रवर्तिनाम् ।
असत्यत्वादयोग्यत्वात् अनौचित्यं द्विधा भवेत् ॥
असत्यत्वकृतं तत् स्याद् अचेतनगतं तु यत् ।
अयोग्यत्वकृतं प्रोक्तं नीचतिर्यङ्नगाश्रयम् ॥

Kumārasvāmin does not refute Vidyādhara, and Rājacūḍāmaṇi dīkṣita fully agrees with Vidyādhara. After reproducing the Ekāvalī, Rājacūḍāmaṇi says that if the Kāvyaprakās'a is not wrong in illustrating Bhayānaka Rasa with the verse

ग्रीवाभङ्गाभिरामम् etc. describing Fear in a deer, it is Rasa in birds and animals, and not Rasābhāsa.

अत एव काव्यप्रकाशिकायां 'ग्रीवाभङ्गाभिरामं मुहुरनुपतति स्यन्दने बद्धदृष्टिः—' इति श्लोकेन भयानकरसः तिर्यग्विषयगततया उदाहृत इत्याहुः ।

Kāvyadarpaṇa, Ch. IV, pp. 211-2, Vāṇīvilās Edn.

Possibly, S'iṅgabhūpāla would reply to Rājacūḍāmaṇi that the Rasa in question is only S'ṛṅgāra, and Aucityaviveka was spoken of only regarding this Rasa and its Ābhāsa. But would he accept that other Rasas in birds and beasts are not Ābhāsa and should a distinction be made among the Rasas?

Haripāla's contribution to this controversy is the creation of a Sambhoga Rasa for rustics, aborigines, birds, beasts etc.

Of Hāsya Rasa, Bharata has given six varieties, ranging from smile to roar, according to the nature of men who are gentle, boisterous and so on. Kavikarṇapūra diminished this number to three. (A. Kau., p. 143.) Bharata himself speaks of a broad three-fold classification of laughter according as men are Uttama, Madhyama or Adhama, refined, moderately refined or unrefined. (N. S'. Ch., VI, pp. 315-7; Gaek. Edn. I.) Further, Bharata has recognised that Laughter has two varieties, Laughing with and Laughing at, Svagata and Paragata or Ātmastha and Parastha. (N. S'., Ch. VI, p. 314.) Of these, I have spoken elsewhere.

Karuṇa varies according as its cause is curse, death and so on (pp. 310 and 332). On p. 332, Karuṇa is considered to be of three kinds, Karuṇa born of peril to Dharma, Karuṇa due to peril to Artha and Karuṇa born of S'oka in general, *i.e.*, S'oka at the loss of relations and the like. The Uttamas are chiefly sorry on issues of Dharma; the Madhyamas, on loss of wealth and other possessions (Artha), and perhaps, only Adhamas are supposed to sorrow too much over the loss of those whom they love (Kāma). This however does not rule out Karuṇa on the loss of the beloved in an Uttamaprakṛti. It appears that only the third variety is S'oka and Karuṇa proper, and that the first two varieties of S'oka in Dharma and Artha, seem to be only Vyabhicārins. Three kinds of Bhayānaka are given, Vyājāt (feigned), Aparādhāt (at having done a mistake) and Vitrāsitaka, born of being timid by nature. The varieties of Bībhatsa,—Kṣobhaṇa and Udvegin, or Kṣobhaṇa, Udvegin and S'uddha—have been spoken of while considering the possibility of a kind of Jugupsā being the Sthāyin of the S'ānta. (See above.) Adbhuta is Divya and Ānandaja, wonder born of heavenly miracles and that produced by the joy one has when things are achieved. Such classifications of Rasas do not have any scientific basis or method in them.

Of the varieties of Rasas, the varieties of Vīra have attracted greatest notice, because an early school of opponents of the S'ānta explained away S'ānta as provided for by one of the varieties of the Vīra mentioned by Bharata. Bharata mentions three kinds of heroism: munificence, Dānavīra, as in Karṇa; sticking to right at all costs, Dharmavīra, as in Yudhiṣṭhira; and martial heroism, Yuddhavīra.

दानवीरं धर्मवीरं युद्धवीरं तथैव च ।
रसं वीरमपि प्राह ब्रह्मा त्रिविधमेव हि ॥ N. S., VI, 99.[1]

[1] Cf. Bharata's description of Utsāha:
तस्य (उत्साहस्य) स्थैर्य धैर्य त्याग वैशारद्यादिभिरनुभावैरभिनयः प्रयोक्तव्यः ।
N. S'., VII, p. 354.

Here again, the first two Vīras do not seem to be Rasas, they can only be Bhāvas. If they are developed as main themes, they will become Aṅgas of S'ānta; or, they will form the Guṇas of the Nāyaka, as Audārya and Dhārmikatva.

A Dayāvīra was then proposed and this Dayāvīra sought to throw out S'ānta for some time. Jagannātha Paṇḍita has pointed out other varieties of Vīra and the Mahābhārata gives a long list of Vīras. All this has been set forth already in the section on S'ānta Rasa. (See above.)

Bhānudatta has taken trouble in his Rasataraṅginī (Ch. II) to prove that Dayāvīra cannot be included in Karuṇa Rasa; there is a confusion here between Karuṇā and Karuṇa.

The Anuyogadvārasūtra cited previously breaks the usual order in enumerating the Rasas and instead of opening with S'ṛṅgāra, opens with Vīra. The gloss says here that Vīra is mentioned first, because it is the noblest and foremost of Rasas, and the Vīra meant here is that associated with Dāna and Tapas. Towards the end of this section, the text and the commentary divide the Rasas into two classes, those vitiated by what are called Sūtra-doṣas such as Falsehood and Injury to others, and those which do not involve these sins. Here Yuddhavīra is considered vitiated by the sin or flaw of Injury to another, Paropaghāta. Similarly Adbhuta involves exaggeration which is a species of Falsehood. But such Vīra as Tapovīra and Dānavīra is, like the Pras'ānta Rasa, free from such Sūtradoṣas.

"अत्र तु त्यागतपोगुणो वीररसे वर्तते। त्यागतपसी च 'त्यागो गुणो गुणशतादधिको मतो मे', 'परं लोकातिगं धाम तपः श्रुतमिति द्वयम्' इत्यादिवचनात् समस्तगुणप्रधान इत्यनया विवक्षया वीररसस्य आदावुपन्यासः।"

तथा कश्चिद्रसः उपघातलक्षणेन सूत्रदोषेण निर्वर्त्यते, यथा—

'स एव प्राणिति प्राणी प्रीतेन कुपितेन च।
वित्तैर्विपक्षरक्तैश्च प्रीणिता येन मार्म(र्ग)णाः॥'

इत्यादिप्रकारं सूत्रं परोपघातलक्षणदोषदुष्टम्, वीररसश्चायम्। ततोऽनेन उपघातलक्षणेन सूत्रदोषेण वीरसोऽत्र निर्वृत्तः। . . . . . तपोदानविषयस्य वीररसस्य प्रशान्तादिरसानां क्वचिदनृतादिदोषान्तरेणापि निष्पत्तेरिति।

In VI, 97, Bharata says that S'ṛṅgāra is of three forms, caused by speech (Vāk), dress (Nepathya), and physical action (Kriyā), and Hāsya and Raudra also have these three forms. But why should he restrict these three forms to S'ṛṅgāra, Hāsya and Raudra only? These three, speech, dress and action, form the three Abhinayas, Vācika, Āhārya and Āṅgika. The Sāttvika comes under the last. All Rasas are roused by these three Abhinayas. So Mātṛgupta says:

रसास्तु त्रिविधा वाचिक-नेपथ्य-स्वभावजाः।
रसानुरूपैरालापैः श्लोकैर्वाक्यैः पदैस्तथा।
नानालंकारसंयुक्तैः **वाचिको रस** इष्यते॥
कर्मरूपवयोजातिदेशकालानुवर्तिभिः।
माल्यभूषणवस्त्राद्यैः **नेपथ्यरस** इष्यते॥
रूपयौवनलावण्यस्थैर्यधैर्यादिभिर्गुणैः।
रसः स्वाभाविको ज्ञेयः स च नाट्ये प्रशस्यते॥

Quoted by Rāghavabhaṭṭa in his S'āk. Vyā.

In another connection, *i.e.*, while describing the Samavakāra type of drama, Bharata speaks of three other kinds of S'ṛṅgāra,—Dharma S'ṛ., Artha S'ṛ. and Kāma S'ṛ.

त्रिविधाकृतिश्रृङ्गारः ज्ञेयो धर्मार्थकामकृतः । N. S'., XX. Kāsī Edn. S'ls. 76-79; *See also* the Nāṭyadarpaṇa, p. 125.

Bhoja postulates a S'ṛṅgāra for each Puruṣārtha and relates the resulting four S'ṛṅgāras with the four types of heroes, Dhīrodātta, Dhīroddhata, Dhīralalita and Dhīrs'ānta. Of this, I have spoken fully in the chapter on Rasa in my Ph.D. thesis on Bhoja's S'ṛṅgāraprakās'a.

VIII

Are all Rasas Pleasurable or Are there some which Are Painful?

This is a very important question into which it is not possible to go completely in this book. It relates to the very theory of the concept of Rasa which is, strictly speaking, out of the scope of this book. While dealing with Haripāla's new and separate Rasa of Vipralambha, it was pointed out that the Rasakalikā of Rudrabhaṭṭa also considered Vipralambha as standing in the way of accepting Rati as a purely pleasurable state and that as a matter of fact, Rasa was both, some Rasas being pleasurable and some painful.

करुणामयानामप्युपादेयत्वं सामाजिकानाम्, रसस्य सुखदुःखात्मकतया तदुभयलक्षणत्वेन उपपद्यते । अत एव तदुभयजनकत्वम् ।

Rasakalikā, Mad. MS., pp. 51-52.

This question takes us straight into the greater one, why do we see and how do we enjoy a tragedy? What is the relish in Karuṇa? This problem, which is still to be solved even in Western literary criticism, cannot be undertaken for discussion here. True, Bhoja also says

रसा हि सुखदुःखावस्थारूपाः ।

Vol. II, Mad. MS., S'ṛ. Pra., p. 369.

but he evidently means here the Laukika bhāvas to which the term Rasa is applied by extension. The Nāṭyadarpaṇa also says in S'. 109 (p. 158) सुखदु:खात्मको रस: and proceeds to elaborately prove in the Vṛtti that some Rasas are certainly painful and that our seeing them and enjoying them is really due to the excellence of the art of either the dramatist or of the art of the actors (p. 159).

The majority of the writers do not accept this view at all which misses the distinction between Laukika bhāva and the Rasa. All the Rasas are considered, uniformly and to an equal extent pleasurable. But it is noteworthy that a writer like Madhusūdana sarasvatī should hold the view that among Rasas, there is a difference of bliss. He first adopts the Sāṁkhyan scheme of three guṇas, Sattva, Rajas and Tamas : Only Sattva can make a Sthāyin and Rasa. In Krodha, which is Rājasa and S'oka, which is Tāmasa, only a shred of Sattva exists, only so much as to make them Sthāyins and give them the blissfulness of Rasa, but this blissfulness or enjoyability is naturally meagre in Krodha and S'oka. Therefore all Rasas cannot be relished in the same measure. He says in his Bhaktirasāyana :

"—द्रवीभावस्य सत्त्वधर्मत्वात्, तं विना च स्थायिभावासंभवात्, सत्त्वगुणस्य च सुखरूपत्वात्, सर्वेषां भावानां सुखमयत्वेऽपि रजस्तमोंऽशमिश्रणात् तारतम्यमवगन्तव्यम् । अतो न सर्वेषु रसेषु तुल्यसुखानुभव: ।" p. 22.

"क्रोधशोकभयादीनां साक्षात्सुखविरोधिनाम् ।
रसत्वमभ्युपगतं तथानुभवमात्रत: ॥" II, 79

After saying this on the basis of the Sāṁkhya, Madhusūdana sarasvatī discusses the question from the Vedāntic standpoint also. All bliss is of the form of Brahmānanda, for bliss is the form of the Brahman. This however does not militate against mundane things also being blissful, for it is said in the Upaniṣad : एतस्यैव आनन्दस्य अन्य आनन्दा मात्रामुपजीवन्ति.

Though literary enjoyment is superior to mundane enjoyment, it is still not on a par with Brahmāsvāda. (I, 10-14.) Compared to Brahmāsvāda, Kāvyarasāsvāda is Laukika. A similar view is propounded by S'āradātanaya also. *See* Bhāvaprakās'a, Intro. pp. 39-40 ; pp. 52-3 G. O. S. Edn. But among literary Rasas also, the S'ānta and Bhakti are on a par with Brahmāsvāda, for there it is the Paramātman and Bhagavān themselves that are involved in them as Sthāyin and Ālambana. The Advaitic approach is seen in full in Ch. III, where Madhusūdana sarasvatī discards his previous Sāṁkhyan conclusion that Rasa is varying in degree in its bliss and says expressly that though, in the world, the Bhāvas are of the forms of Sukha, Duḥkha and Moha, their counterparts in the Kāvya and in the hearts of the spectator, are all of the form of bliss only.

बोध्यनिष्ठा यथास्वं ते सुखदु:खादिहेतव: ।
बोद्धृनिष्ठास्तु सर्वेऽपि सुखमात्रैकहेतव: ॥ 5.

Sattva begins to spread and dominate as the sole Vṛtti of the Antaḥkaraṇa and Rasa is then manifested.

समूहालम्बनात्मैका जायते सात्त्विकी मति: ॥
सानन्तरक्षणेऽवश्यं व्यनक्ति सुखमुत्तमम् । III, 12-13.

IX

New Vyabhicārins and Sāttvikas

We have seen how freely later writers debated the question of adding newer Rasas to those that Bharata gave. But did not writers feel also that there was no finality about Bharata's list of Vyabhicārins and Sāttvikas and their number, thirty-three and eight?

Bharata gave the Bhāvas in three sets as Sthāyins, Vyabhicārins and Sāttvikas. We have already examined and found that all the eight Sthāyins become Vyabhicārins also. Therefore these eight, the Sthāyins, must be added to the thirty-three Vyabhicārins. But when this addition is made, we have to reduce the thirty-three by removing a few which are redundant. Thus when S'oka becomes a Vyabhicārin, there is no need for Viṣāda; Bhaya in its Vyabhicārin-grade eliminates Trāsa; Sāgaranandin actually gives Trāsa as the Sthāyin [1]. Krodha removes Amarṣa. This gives us eight and thirty Vyabhicārins. Further reduction is possible. Among the thirty, we have two Bhāvas, Glāni and S'rama, one of which will suffice. Not only do they look akin at first sight but prove to be identical also when their descriptions are examined. Another case of repetition is Nidrā and Supta; the second is very delicately distinguished from the first.

[1] Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakos'a, edn. Myles Dillon, London, 1937, line 243.

Bharata describes the latter as Nidrābhibhava and Nidrāsamuttha. If two are thus removed, we have eight and twenty-eight. Some writers did see the redundance at least in the case of Nidrā and Supta and, instead of Supta, gave a new Vyabhicārin called S'auca, as for instance, those whom Sāgaranandin, author of the Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakos'a (pp. 83-87) follows.

Why did Bharata classify the Bhāvas into Vyabhicārins and Sāttvikas? Among Bhāvas, there are only two classes, Sthāyins and Vyabhicārins. The Anubhāvas, the twenty Alaṁkāras of damsels, Bhāva, Hāva etc.,[1] the eight Sāttvikas, Ālāpa etc., given as modes of Vācikābhinaya, the ten Kāma Avasthās[2]—all these are comprehended in the term Vyabhicārin. Bhoja calls the Sāttvikas, Bāhya vyabhicārins:

तत्र आभ्यन्तरा व्यभिचारिषु चिन्तौत्सुक्यावेगवितर्कादयः, बाह्याः स्वेदरोमाञ्चाश्रुवैवर्ण्यादयः । S'ṛ. Pra., Ch. xi.

But out of these numberless subsidiary mental states, there are a few which are more major, compared to others; not only are they major, but they are more definitely mental states than others which are physical manifestations. It may

[1] Rāhula added to this set Maugdhya, Mada, Bhāvikatva and Paritapana according to Abhinava. *See* J. O. R. Vol. VI, pp. 208-210, my article on 'Writers quoted in the Abhinavabhāratī'. *See* also Hemacandra, K.A., p. 316, where Abhinava's sentence referring to Rāhula's additions is reproduced. *See* also Padmas'rī's Nāgarasarvasva following Rāhula's school, Ch. vii, S'ls. 3-4, where Vikṣepa, Mada, Maugdhya and Tapana are given in addition. (p. 29, Tanusukharam Sarma's edn., Bombay, 1921). While defining Vikṣepa, Padmas'rī quotes a writer named Kapila. Bhoja added Vihṛta, Krīḍita and Keli which S'iṅga criticised. Vis'vanātha accepts Rāhula's and Bhoja's additions and has, in addition, three more, Kutūhala, Hasita and Cakita. (J. O. R. VI, pp. 209-210.)

[2] Bhānudatta shows in his R. T. how the ten Madanāvasthās are included in the Vyabhicārins. (Ch. 5, p. 109, Edn. Venkatesvara Steam Press, with Hindi Com.)

be asked if the more major among these accessory mental states are only those given by Bharata and if there are not others. It has been pointed out that this list of Bharata can be reduced on one side; and as a matter of fact, it has been added to also on the other side. Bhoja, in his S'ṛ. Pra., omits Apasmāra and Maraṇa and gives in their place, Īrṣyā (which S'iṅgabhūpāla refutes) and S'ama which is needed for the S'ānta Rasa (Ch. xi). In his S.K.Ā., Bhoja counts among his thirty-three Vyabhicārins Sneha which S'iṅgabhūpāla refutes and, instead of adding S'ama as in his S'ṛ. Pra., takes Dhṛti itself, one of the old Vyabhicārins given by Bharata, as the Sthāyin of S'ānta. S'iṅgabhūpāla raises the point that there can be more Vyabhicārins, mentions some—Udvega, Sneha, Dambha, Īrṣyā—but dismisses these as included in some of the thirty-three, with reasons which look strained. Bhānudatta proposes Chala :

"अत्र प्रतिभाति च्छलमधिको व्यभिचारिभाव इति ।" (Ch. 5.)

and shows its occurrence in S'ṛṅgāra, Raudra and Hāsya. But it seems to be possible to include it in Bharata's Avahittha. (*Vide* its description, p. 373, GOS. edn. N.S'. I). Rūpa Gosvāmin, in his scheme of Madhura Rasa, accepts at first the traditional thirty-three Vyabhicārins and adds afterwards thirteen more Vyabhicārins generally, as also a few more specially under some individual Rasas (*Vide* Dr. S.K. De, IHQ, 1932, p. 663). Dr. De adds that the thirteen additional Vyabhicārins are brought by Rūpa under one or the other of the old thirty-three.

Bharata himself discusses the question of the separate naming and enumeration of the eight Sāttvikas. He says: as a matter of fact all Bhāvas enacted have to be 'entered into'; Sattva is 'entering into'; but still this 'entering into the state' is all the more necessary in the case of the eight Sāttvikas. For, a tear has actually to be shed. *See* pp. 379-381, GOS. edn. N. S'. I. Bhoja says that in truth all Bhāvas are Sāttvikas, because Sattva means 'Mind'.

सात्त्विका अपि सर्व एव, मनःप्रभवत्वात् । अनुपहतं हि मनः सत्त्वमित्युच्यते ।

S'ṛ. Pra., Vol. II, p. 354, Mad. MS.

S'iṅgabhūpāla also says :

सर्वेऽपि सत्त्वमूलत्वाद् भावा यद्यपि सात्त्विकाः ।
तथाप्यमीषां सत्त्वैकमूलत्वात् सात्त्विकप्रथा ॥

R. A. S., I. 310.

The only writer, now known, to propose a ninth Sāttvika, is Bhānudatta. He proposes Jṛmbhā in his Rasataraṅgiṇī :

जृम्भा च नवमः सात्त्विको भाव इति प्रतिभाति । p. 66.

Bhānudatta would not base himself on the meaning 'तन्मयीभवन' for the word Sattva and justify the separate enumeration of the Sāttvikas. For Sattva so understood would apply to the Vyabhicārins also. So, he interprets Sattva as the 'body'—Jīvas'arīra. Tear, Perspiration etc. are physical states and as such are distinct from the Vyabhicārins which are mental states. The former are Bāhya, the latter Āntara.[1] (Rasataraṅgiṇī,

[1] Bharata uses Sattva as meaning also the opposite of mind *viz.*, the physical body, and calls Bhāva, Hāva etc. by the name 'Sāttvikābhinaya'. *See* Ch. XXIV, 5-7 and 40.

देहात्मकं भवेत्सत्त्वं सत्त्वाद्भावः समुत्थितः । and सत्त्वजोऽभिनयः पूर्वं मया प्रोक्तो द्विजोत्तमाः ।

Abhinava also says "बाह्याश्च बाष्पप्रभृतयः", Abhi. Bhā., Ch. 7, p. 343, GOS. edn. I.

pp. 57-58 and 7-9). To accord with this, Bhānudatta defines a Bhāva not as a Cittavṛtti, but as a 'Rasānukūla vikāra', which is of two kinds, Ābhyantara (Sthāyin and Vyabhicārin) and Bāhya (Sāttvika etc.). But to exclude too palpably physical acts, he gives them a different name Ceṣṭā which, he says, is different from Vikāra. The difference between the two is that while a Vikāra like a tear cannot be made to appear according to man's desire, a Ceṣṭā like Aṅgākṛṣṭi and Akṣimardana is *done* by man of his own will.

"न चाङ्गाकृष्टिनेत्रमर्दनादीनामपि भावत्वापत्तिः। तेषां भावलक्षणाभावात्। रसानुकूलो विकारो भाव इति हि तल्लक्षणम्। अङ्गाकृष्टयादयो हि न विकाराः। किन्तु शरीरचेष्टाः। प्रत्यक्षसिद्धमेतत्। अङ्गाकृष्टिरक्षिमर्दनं च पुरुषैरिच्छया विधीयते परित्यज्यते च। जृम्भा च विकारादेव भवति, तन्निवृत्तौ निवर्तते चेति।"

Rasataraṅgiṇī, p. 69.

X

RASA-SYNTHESIS

Karuṇa

The artistic mind has always shown a partiality for pathos. It is said that the sweetest songs are often songs of sorrow. The first Kāvya in Sanskrit rose out of the sense of pity. 'रसेषु करुणो रसः' is a well-known anonymous saying. Ānandavardhana says that the quality of sweetness which is the melting of the heart is found in the highest degree in Karuṇa.

माधुर्यमार्द्रतां याति यतस्तत्राधिकं मनः। Dhva. Ā., II.

But to point out the beauty and appeal of a Rasa is not to do any synthesis. By Rasa-synthesis is meant a reducing of all Rasas to the nature of one, a formulation of one as Prakṛti and the rest as its Vikṛtis.

No Ālaṁkārika ever attempted a Karuṇa-synthesis, but Bhavabhūti, in his drama, Uttararāmacarita, *suggested* such a synthesis in Karuṇa. Ānandavardhana explains that the Rāmāyaṇa is an epic of Karuṇa:

रामायणे हि करुणो रसः स्वयमादिकविना सूत्रितः 'शोकः श्लोकत्वमागतः' इत्येवंवादिना। निर्व्यूढश्च स एव सीतात्यन्तवियोगपर्यन्तमेव स्वप्रबन्धमुपरचयता।

Dhva. Ā., IV, p. 237.

Bhavabhūti gave the same opinion when he said :

भगवान् भूतार्थवादी प्राचेतसः . . . .
पावनं वचनामृतं **करुणाद्भुतरसं** च किञ्चिदुपनिबद्धम् etc. Act. VII.

Writing a masterpiece dominated by Karuṇa, Bhavabhūti, in a self-conscious mood, says through S'leṣa :

अहो संविधानकम्—

एको रसः करुण एव निमित्तभेदाद्
भिन्नः पृथक्पृथगिव श्रयते विवर्तान् ।
आवर्तबुद्बुदतरङ्गमयान् विकारान्
अम्भो यथा सलिलमेव हि तत्समस्तम् ॥ U. R. C., III, 47.

"O! what a great play I have written!" he *seems* to exclaim to himself. By context, the passage refers to Tamasā observing the pathos that was there in everybody, though in different forms.

"एक एव सन्नपि निमित्तभेदात् सखित्वपतित्वपत्नीत्वाद्युपाधिभेदाद् भिन्नः विलक्षण इव पृथक्पृथग् विवर्तान् श्रयते । वासन्तीसीतारामप्रभृतिषु परस्परविलक्षणावस्थाविशेषान् भजति ।"

Vīrarāghava's com., p. 99, N. S. Edn.

A general import bearing on our present subject of Rasa-synthesis can also be seen in this verse. Bhavabhūti seems to say that there is only one Rasa, Karuṇa, and that it assumes the different forms called S'ṛṅgāra etc., even as the same water assumes the forms of whirl, bubble etc. Karuṇa is the Prakṛti; the other Rasas are its Vikṛtis. Vīrarāghava, a commentator, also saw such a meaning in this verse which shows that the interpretation is authenticated by tradition.

"एक इति । रस्यते स्वाद्यत इति रसः काव्यानुशीलनाभ्यासवशविशदीभूतवर्णनीयतन्मयीभवनयोग्यसामाजिकमनोमुकुरभाव्यमानतया निर्भरानन्दसंविद्रूपः । करुण इष्टजनवियोगजन्यदुःखातिशयः । एक एव सन्नपि निमित्तभेदात् व्यञ्जकविभावादिविच्छित्तिविशेषाद् भिन्नः विलक्षणः । पृथक् पृथग् विवर्तान् परस्परविलक्षणशृङ्गाराद्यात्मना परिणामान् । "व्यस्तपरिणामः स्याद्विवर्तः" इति कपिलः । श्रयते भजते . . . .
इदमत्र कवेर्मतम्—यद्यपि शृङ्गार एक एव रस इति शृङ्गारप्रकाशकारादिमतम्, तथापि **प्राचुर्याद् रागिविरागिसाधारण्यात्** करुण एक एव रसः । अन्ये तु तद्विकृतयः इति ।" Vīrarāghava's Com., p. 99.

To the Karuṇa-synthesis suggested by Bhāvabhūti, this commentator added two arguments, one that Karuṇa is present to the largest extent in life, and the other, that it is found not only in men with mundane desires but in the Yogins also. These however do not make for the Prakṛti-Vikṛti-bhāva in Bhavabhūti's verse, and that alone forms the meaning of 'Synthesis'. In English, the word 'Sympathy' meaning 'response to another's feeling of sorrow', has come to be used in an enlarged sense to mean all forms of aesthetic response and attunement of heart, Cittasaṁvāda ; and here is a linguistic argument in :favour of a Karuṇa-synthesis. For it seems, the model and the supreme example of a complete attunement of heart, which poetry and drama effects, is certainly the attunement of hearts in Karuṇa.

S'ĀNTA

A regular attempt at synthesis in the field of Rasas by a theorist is however to be seen earliest only in the Abhinavabhāratī of Abhinavagupta. He sponsored the S'ānta-synthesis

by considering the S'ānta as the one fundamental Rasa of which the other Rasas are modifications. He called S'ānta the greatest Rasa, first because of its relation to the last and the greatest Puruṣārtha, Mokṣa. Next, poetic delight called Rasa is always of a non-worldly, Alaukika, character, shorn as it is of all mundane associations, a limitless, unbounded and ineffable bliss, and hence is of the form of S'ānta.

"तत्र सर्वरसानां शान्तप्राय एवास्वादः, विषयेभ्यो विपरिवृत्त्या— ।" Abhi. Bhā., VI, p. 340, Gaek. Edn.

Further, the Sthāyin of S'ānta, the Ātman, is the very substratum of all mental activities; it is the one basic Citta illumined by this Ātman that takes the form of the Vṛttis of S'ṛṅgāra etc. Thus it is Sthāyitama; it is the Sthāyin of the Sthāyins, the Prakṛti of which Rati, Hāsa and the rest are Vikṛtis. Says Abhinava—

अत्र सर्वप्रकृतित्वाभिधानाय पूर्वमभिधानम् ।

Gaek. Edn., I, p. 340.

And according to some mss. known to Abhinava, the S'ānta Rasa section is found at the very beginning, even before the S'ṛṅgāra section.

"तथा च चिरन्तनपुस्तकेषु 'स्थायिभावान् रसत्वमुपनेष्यामः' इत्यनन्तरम् 'शान्तो नाम शमस्थायिभावात्मकः' इत्यादि लक्षणं पठ्यते ।"

Gaek. Edn., I, p. 340.

The S'ānta text found in Bharata, according to some, definitely states this S'ānta-synthesis in two verses:

भावा विकारा रत्याद्याः शान्तस्तु प्रकृतिर्मतः ।
विकारः प्रकृतेर्जातः पुनस्तत्रैव लीयते ॥

स्वं स्वं निमित्तमासाद्य शान्ताद्भावः प्रवर्तते ।
पुनर्निमित्तापाये च शान्त एवोपलीयते ॥

N. S'., VI, pp. 335-6, Gaek. Edn. I.

This has already been indicated in the S'ānta Rasa section of this paper.

AHAṄKĀRA-S'ṚṄGĀRA

When Abhinava was synthesising the Rasas in S'ānta, a similar synthetic spirit was working in Bhoja who merged every Rasa and Bhāva in a *new S'ṛṅgāra* he formulated. He said that at the root of all Bhāvas lay the germ of Ahaṅkāra otherwise called S'ṛṅgāra and Abhimāna. It is a Guṇa of the Ātman and is the result of past good acts. By Ahaṅkāra is meant a self-consciousness or the sense of 'I' which marks off the cultured from the uncultured. It is that by which not only for himself but for others and other objects also does man have any love. In this sense it is called Ātma-rati. It is this 'Ego' or 'Self-love' that is the one Rasa. Its manifestations are Rati, Hāsa etc. Thus this basic S'ṛṅgāra is different from the first derivative of that name, the S'ṛṅgāra developed from Rati. So this S'ṛṅgāra-synthesis is not a synthesis in the first of the eight old Rasas of Bharata and others. This theory finds a brief statement in the fifth chapter of Bhoja's S. K. Ā. and an elaborate exposition in his Ṣ'ṛ. Pra. I have set this forth at great length in my Ph. D. thesis on Bhoja's S'ṛ. Pra., and here I give only a brief account. The S. K. Ā. says:

रसोऽभिमानोऽहङ्कारः शृङ्गार इति गीयते ।
योऽर्थस्तस्यान्वयात् काव्यं कमनीयत्वमश्नुते ॥

विशिष्टादृष्टजन्मायं जन्मिनामन्तरात्मसु ।
आत्मसम्यग्गुणोद्भूतेरेको हेतुः प्रकाशते ॥

Ch. V, S'ls. 1-2, p. 474, N. S. Edn.

(*See* also Vṛtti on p. 613 where Bhoja quotes Daṇḍin and draws out his own theory from Daṇḍin's verse). The S'ṛ. Pra. says:

आत्मस्थितं गुणविशेषमहंकृतस्य श्रृङ्गारमाहुरिह जीवितमात्मयोनेः ।
तस्यात्मशक्तिरसनीयतया रसत्वं युक्तस्य येन रसिकोऽयमिति प्रवादः ॥

. . . . .

अप्रातिकूल्किकतया मनसो मुदादेः यस्संविदोऽनुभवहेतुरिहाभिमानः ।
ज्ञेयो रसस्स रसनीयतया आत्मरक्तेः . . .

While Abhinava in his S'ānta-synthesis took his stand on that ultimate ripple-less state of the Ātman, Bhoja, adopting the Sāṁkhya and a Nyāya phraseology, took his stand on the Ātman with its first shoot of Ahaṅkāra. To Bhoja, even S'ānta would appear only within the world of Ahaṅkāra; for to him, any Bhāva or Rasa can be experienced only through Ahaṅkāra. S'ama as much as Rati is the product of Ahaṅkāra.

" . . . तच्च आत्मनोऽहङ्कारगुणविशेषं ब्रूमः । स श्रृङ्गारः सोऽभिमानः स रसः । तत एते रत्यादयो जायन्ते । तैश्चायं प्रकर्षप्राप्तैः सप्तार्चिरर्चिश्चयैरिव प्रकाशमानः श्रृङ्गारिणामेव स्वदत इति ।"

S'ṛ. Pra., Mad. MS., Vol. II, p. 356.

What is called Rasa is an experience of bliss unconditioned by any name. So long as there is the knowledge of the state being Rati or Hāsa or anything else, the spectator

is only in the state of Bhāvanā and Bhāva; beyond this is the state of Rasa. Says Bhoja:

आभावनोदयमनन्यधिया जनेन
यो भाव्यते मनसि भावनया स भावः ।
यो भावनापथमतीत्य विवर्तमानः
साहंकृतौ हृदि परं स्वदते रसोऽसौ ॥

Thus S'ṛṅgāra, Hāsya, Vīra—these are but Bhāva-states in reality. The truth of Rasa is that it is only one and has no more name than Rasa.

PREMAN

Side by side with or rather within this Ahaṅkāra-S'ṛṅgāra synthesis, Bhoja formulates a synthesis in Preman also. Preman to him is a fundamental love lying at the root of Rati, Sneha, Bhakti, why, at the root of all Bhāvas in much the same manner as Ahaṅkāra itself. If one laughs, it is because he *loves* to laugh; if he fights, he *loves* to do so. Thus all activities go to fulfil a certain love which is innate in man and which explains all his activities; it is this love which makes all his activities a self-fulfilment. Bhoja has three stages of his Rasa,—the Pūrva koṭi, the Madhyamā avasthā and the Uttarā koṭi. In the first, it is the one Ahaṅkāra; in the second, the one Ahaṅkāra has become the forty-nine Bhāvas, each growing to its relative climax through its Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas etc.; in the third all these several Bhāvas become aspects of Preman, or rather ripen into Preman, from which stage again, experience passes into the primary stage of the one Rasa of Ahaṅkāra.

. "प्रेयः प्रियतराख्यानमित्यनेन समस्तभावमूर्धाभिषिक्ताया रतेः परप्रकर्षाधिगमाद् भावनाधि(ति?)गमे भावरूपतामुल्लङ्घ्य प्रेमरूपेण परिणतायाः उपादानात् भावान्तराणामपि परप्रकर्षाधिगमे रसरूपेण परिणतिरिति ज्ञापयन्नहङ्कारस्य **उत्तरां** कोटिमुपलक्षयति। सर्वेषामपि हि रत्यादिप्रकर्षाणां रतिप्रियो रणप्रियः परिहासप्रियः अमर्षप्रिय इति प्रेम्ण्येव पर्यवसानं भवति।"

S. K. Ā., p. 613.

In the S'ṛ. Pra. he adds: रसं त्विह प्रेमाणमेवामनन्ति। Ch. xi, Vol. II, Mad. MS., pp. 352-3.

This Preman-synthesis finds an advocate in Kavikarṇapūra, the author of the Alaṁkārakaustubha where he says:

. प्रेमरसे सर्वे रसा अन्तर्भवन्तीत्यत्र महीयानेव प्रपञ्चः। ग्रन्थगौरवभयाद् दिङ्मात्रमुक्तम्। . . . तथा च—

'उन्मज्जन्ति निमज्जन्ति प्रेम्ण्यखण्डरसत्वतः।
सर्वे रसाश्च भावाश्च तरङ्गा इव वारिधौ॥'

pp. 147-8, Vārendra Edn.

RATI-S'ṚṄGĀRA

The Agnipurāṇa took Bhoja's Ahaṅkāra, but instead of saying that Rati and all other Bhāvas emanated from it, said that Rati was the first born of Abhimāna which was itself a product of Ahaṅkāra and this Rati modified itself into Hāsa etc. It further went behind Ahaṅkāra and said that Ahaṅkāra is the first manifestation of Rasa or Camatkāra which is the manifestation of the Ānanda, the innate nature of the Supreme Being called Para Brahman.

अक्षरं परमं ब्रह्म सनातनमजं विभु।
वेदान्तेषु वदन्त्येकं चैतन्यं ज्योतिरीश्वरम्॥
आनन्दस्सहजस्तस्य व्यज्यते स कदाचन।
व्यक्तिस्सा तस्य चैतन्यचमत्काररसाह्वया॥
आद्यस्तस्य विकारो यः सोऽहङ्कार इति स्मृतः।
ततोऽभिमानः तत्रेदं समाप्तं भुवनत्रयम्॥
अभिमानाद्रतिस्सा च परिपोषमुपेयुषी।
व्यभिचार्यादिसामान्यात् शृङ्गार इति गीयते॥
तद्भेदाः काममितरे हास्याद्या अप्यनेकशः।
स्वस्वस्थायिविशेषोऽथ (षोत्थ) परिघो(पो)षस्वलक्षणाः॥

A. P., Ch. 339, S'ls. 1-6.

ADBHUTA

Wonder is an invariable element in all enjoyment, mundane or artistic. In art and literature, the element of surprise, extraordinariness, wonder, is present everywhere. The very theme has to be striking; for, when we see an extraordinary situation, do we not describe it as being dramatic? Wonder helps love. Hāsya is only reversed wonder. The part Adbhuta has in Vīra is too plain; Bharata describes Adbhuta as born of Vīra. The hold of Adbhuta on the minds of the audience is fully realised by Bharata who says that the dramatist must so work out his story, so weave it, hide some and reveal some, that the audience may get at each step a surprise and a thrill. One of the ends which the means to developing the plot called the Sandhyaṅgas serve is the presentation of the story in a wondrous manner—'**आश्चर्यवदभिख्यानम्**' N. S'., XXI, Kās'ī edn., S'l. 54. There is again the need to

intricately complicate the problems of the story and give out a series of revelations in the end, thus carrying away the heart in the end with thrill after thrill. This can be realised, for instance, when the closing scene of the Mṛcchakaṭika or the Mālavikāgnimitra is read. The story has to be, says Bharata, in the form of a cow's tail, bushy at the end, with a crowd of suprises. There must be Adbhuta in the end.

कार्यं गोपुच्छाग्रं कर्तव्यं काव्यबन्धमासाद्य ।
ये चोदात्ता भावाः ते सर्वे पृष्ठतः कार्याः ॥
सर्वेषां काव्यानां नानारसभावयुक्तियुक्तानाम् ।
निर्वहणे कर्तव्यो नित्यं हि रसोऽद्भुतस्तज्ज्ञैः ॥

N. S'., XX, 46-47.

Similarly, on the side of verbal expression, the Vācya-vācaka, or the Vācikābhinaya in drama, Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin made a synthesis in Adbhuta when they praised Atis'ayokti as the one great figure of which the rest are but several forms.

इत्येवमादिरुदिता गुणातिशययोगतः ।
सर्वैवातिशयोक्तिस्तु तर्कयेत्तां यथागमम् ॥
सैषा सर्वैव वक्रोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते ।
यत्नोऽस्यां कविना कार्यः कोऽलङ्कारोऽनया विना ॥

Bhāmaha, K. A., II, 84-85.

असावतिशयोक्तिः स्याद् अलङ्कारोत्तमा यथा ।

. . . . . .

अलङ्कारान्तराणामप्येकमाहुः परायणम् ।
वागीशमहितामुक्तिम् इमामतिशयाह्वयाम् ॥

Daṇḍin, K. Ā., II, 214-220.

This point has been explained at some length by Ānanda and Abhinava in the Dhva. Ā. and the Locana, Ud. III, pp. 206-209. The very strikingness of poetic expression is Atis'aya and Adbhuta:

" . . . लोकोत्तीर्णेन रूपेण अवस्थानम् . . .
लोकोत्तरेण चैवातिशयः । तेन अतिशयोक्तिः सर्वालङ्कारसामान्यम् । "

Locana, p. 208.[1]

This Adbhuta or element of surprise characterises the climax-condition of all the Rasas. Adbhuṭa thus permeates a composition, its Alaṁkāra, Vastu and Rasa.

The regular theory of a synthesis of Rasas in Adbhuta was however made by an ancestor of the author of the Sāhityadarpaṇa. He was known as Nārāyaṇa. In Ch. 3 of his S. D., Vis'vanātha gives this Adbhuta-synthesis in his Vṛtti on verse three, in the name of his ancestor, Nārāyaṇa, and herein quotes a verse and a half to that effect from the writing of one Dharmadatta. This Dharmadatta is cited as reviewing Bhoja's S'ṛṅgāra-theory in the Rasasudhānidhi of Soṇthi Māra Bhaṭṭāraka, available in a manuscript in the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library (R. 3210). P. V. Kane says in his Introduction to the S. D. (p. cxxi) that this Dharmadatta was a contemporary of a subsequent Nārāyaṇa who was Vis'vanātha's grandfather and was defeated by this Nārāyaṇa in a debate in the Kaliṅga court. This Dharmadatta wrote an Alaṁkāra treatise in which he stated the theory of

[1] Under Adbhuta Rasa, Bhānudatta says in his Rasataraṅgiṇī—
'अत्युक्ति भ्रमोक्ति चित्रोक्ति विरोधाभासप्रभृतयोऽद्भुता एव ।'
Under Citrokti mentioned here, he brings all expressions turning on Lakṣaṇā. 'लाक्षणिकमखिलं चित्रोक्तिरेव ।'

Adbhuta-synthesis first propounded by the older Nārāyaṇa. The text of this synthesis in the S. D. runs as follows:

चमत्कारश्चित्तविस्ताररूपः विस्मयापरपर्यायः । तत्प्राणत्वं च अस्मत्पितामहसहृदयगोष्ठीगरिष्ठकविपण्डितमुख्यश्रीमन्नारायणपादैरुक्तम् । तदाह धर्मदत्तः स्वग्रन्थे—

'रसे सारश्चमत्कारः सर्वत्राप्यनुभूयते ।
तच्चमत्कारसारत्वे सर्वत्राप्यद्भुतो रसः ॥
तस्माददद्भुतमेवाह कृती नारायणो रसम् ।' इति । S. D., III.

It is accepted that Camatkāra is Rasāsvāda. This Camatkāra is a 'fillip' of the mind which is in essence a wonder. The 'Lokottaratva' of all Rasāsvāda, accepted on all hands, again points to Adbhuta. Bhānudatta accepts that in S'ṛṅgāra and other cases there is an element of Adbhuta as Aṅga; where it is Aṅgin, the Rasa becomes Adbhuta proper.

शृङ्गारादौ चमत्कारदर्शनाद्यत्र मनोविकृ(स्तृ ?)तिरङ्गतया भासते तत्र शृङ्गारादय एव रसाः । प्राधान्येन यत्र भासते तत्राद्भुत एव रसः ।

Rasataraṅgiṇī, Ch. I.

Prabhākara, author of the Rasapradīpa (p. 40, edn. Princess of Wales Sarasvatī Bhavan Texts), refutes this Adbhuta-synthesis:

"—इति नारायणेन अद्भुत एव रस इत्यभिहितम् । धर्मदत्तादिभिश्च तदेवानुसृतम् । तन्न साधु । वैलक्षण्यस्य अनुभवसिद्धत्वात् । प्रकृतिभेदाच्च । नापि व्यभिचारिषु स्थायिन इव रत्यादिषु विस्मयानुगमः । शोकादिषु तथाननुगमात् ।" etc.

Prabhākara goes at length and says in the end that he has refuted this theory of 'Adbhuta in all Rasas' in his earlier Alaṁkāra work, the Alaṁkārarahasya, also, which is not available to us now.

On the practical side, S'aktibhadra's Ās'caryacūḍāmaṇi illustrates the dominating Rasa of Adbhuta, and this has been explained in detail by Professor Mm. S. Kuppuswami Sastri in his Introduction (pp. 12-15) to the Bālamanoramā edn. of this play. The now lost Kṛtyārāvaṇa also seems to be a play which specialised in Adbhuta. Towards the end of the 17th century, young Mahādeva wrote his Adbhutadarpaṇa, where his Rāma is made to say:

यत्सत्यमभितः स्तब्धैः इन्द्रियैरिन्द्रजालवत् ।
अद्भुतैकरसावृत्तिः अन्तर्मीलयतीव माम् ॥

Kāvyamālā, 55, IV, 8.

Rasa only One

It may be granted that an element of wonder enters many Rasas, but it is absent at least in Karuṇa as Prabhākara effectively points out. Though Rasāsvāda is Cittasaṁvāda and is called Camatkāra, the Cittasaṁvāda is not, in all cases, of the form of an 'enlargement', Vistāra. There is Vikṣobha as in Bībhatsa, and there is Druti as in S'ṛṅgāra and Karuṇa. This Druti of S'ṛṅgāra and Karuṇa is totally absent in Raudra, Bībhatsa, Bhayānaka and Adbhuta, and in this way the Karuṇa-synthesis is defective. Abhinava's S'ānta and Bhoja's Ahaṅkara-S'ṛṅgāra, going to the very substratum of the emotions may be conceded some validity; so also the synthesis in Preman, Vīra meaning Preman for Utsāha, and so on.

But though it might be difficult to prove and accept that all the Rasas are but forms of some one of them, it has been recognised by all writers that Rasa as such, the ineffable bliss, is one. Rasa is Rasa. It has no other name. It is one. It is like the Brahman or the Sphoṭa. The names S'ṛṅgāra, Vīra etc. and the consequent plurality and difference are ultimately unreal; or they are at best *like* parts of a whole. Hence it is that Bharata also, says Abhinava, uses the singular—

न हि रसाद् ऋते कश्चिदर्थः प्रवर्तते ।

N. S'., V. pp. 273-4.

"—तत एव निर्विघ्नस्वसंवेदनात्मक**विश्रान्ति**लक्षणेन **रसना**-परपर्यायेण व्यापारेण गृह्यमाणत्वाद् रसशब्देनाभिधीयते । तेन रस एव नाट्यम्, यस्य व्युत्पत्तिः फलमित्युच्यते । तथा च 'रसादृते' (६-३३) इत्यत्र एकवचनोपपत्तिः । ततश्च मुख्यभूतान्**महारसात्** स्फोटदृशीव असत्यानि वा, अन्विताभिधानदृशीव उभयात्मकानि सत्यानि वा, अभिहितान्वयदृशीव तत्समुदायिरूपाणि वा, रसान्तराणि भागाभिनिवेशदृष्टानि रूप्यन्ते (?) ।"

GOS. Edn., Abhi. Bhā., I, p. 269.

Again, commenting on the Sūtra न हि रसादृते etc., Abhinava says that though names are given to it differently according to its evoking conditions, Rasa is fundamentally one. and hence it is that Bharata refers to it in the singular number,

पूर्वत्र बहुवचनमत्र चैकवचनं प्रयुञ्जानस्यायमाशयः । **एक एव तावत्परमार्थतो रसः** सूत्रस्थानत्वेन रूपके प्रतिभाति । तस्यैव पुनर्भागदृशा विभागः ।

Abhi. Bhā., I, p. 273.

Abhinava says that therefore Rasa and Nāṭya mean the same thing.[1] In experience also we find that our relish is one undefined state of the form of a repose of the mind, Vis'rānti. Bhaṭṭa Narasiṁha, a later commentator on Bhoja's S. K. Ā., in his exposition of Bhoja's Rasa theory, points out that Rasa as relish, Svāda, is one.

"अष्टावेव स्थायिन इति कुतः? तावतामेव स्वादात्मकत्वादिति चेत्, किमेतेष्वनुस्यूत एकः स्वादात्मा? तर्ह्यनक्षरमिदमुक्तम्—एतेषां कूटस्थ एक एव स्वादात्मा ; एते च तद्विशेषा इति—"

"अत्रे (अतः) सर्वेषां कूटस्था(स्थ) एक एंव स्वादात्मा ।"

Mad. MS., R. 2499, p. 150.

Kavikarṇapūra Gosvāmin states the point more elaborately and clearly. He considers a certain blissful state of the mind, which is a quality (Guṇa) of the mind established in the Sattvaguṇa and completely devoid of any touch of either Rajas or Tamas, as the one eternal Sthāyin and the one eternal Rasa. This Sthāyin called Ānanda or 'Āsvādāṅkurakaṇda' is separately and diversely named according to the different causal conditions, the Vibhāvas. The difference between this writer and Abhinava and others is that he expressly postulates a Sthāyin also for this one Rasa which they do not in so many words, though their position implies this one Sthāyin also.

"आस्वादाङ्कुरकन्दोऽस्ति धर्मः कश्चन चेतसः ।
रजस्तमोभ्यां हीनस्य शुद्धसत्वतया सतः ॥

[1] *Cf.* his Locana, p. 149. प्रीत्यात्मा च रसः, तदेव नाट्यम्, etc. *Cf.* also Abhinava's borrower S'ārṅgadeva : नाट्यशब्दो रसे मुख्यः । VII, 17. Saṁ. Ratnākara.

स **स्थायी** कथ्यते विज्ञैः—विभावस्य पृथक्तया ।
पृथग्विधत्वं यात्येष सामाजिकतया सताम् ॥ " S'l. 63.

सामाजिकतया सतां सामाजिकानाम् **एक एव** कश्चिदास्वादाङ्कुरकन्दो मनसः कोऽपि धर्मविशेषः स्थायी । स तु विभावस्य उक्तप्रकारद्विविधस्य भेदैरेव भिद्यते । Alaṁ. Kau. V. Chap.

Commentary: "एक एवेति—ननु **स्थायिभावरूपधर्मस्य एकत्वे** कथमेकस्य स्थायिनः वीररसे उत्साहत्वम्, करुणरसे शोकत्वम्, अद्भुतरसे विस्मयत्वं भवति, परस्परविरुद्धानामेतेषाम् उत्साहत्वादीनाम् एकस्मिन् स्थायिरूपधर्मे वृत्तित्वाभावादित्याह—स त्विति । स एकोऽपि धर्मः उक्तप्रकारद्विविधस्य विभावस्य भेदैरेव भिन्नो भवति इत्यर्थः । यथैक एव स्फटिकः जपाकुसुमादिनानापदार्थानां सङ्गात् कदाचिद्रक्तः, कदाचित् पीतः कदाचिच्छ्यामः, इत्यादिविविधाकारो भवति, तथा एक एव स्थायिरूपो धर्मः वीररसादिपोषकानां नानाविधविभावानां सङ्गात् कदाचिदुत्साहरूपः, कदाचिद्विस्मयरूपः, कदाचित् शोकरूपः इत्यादिविविधाकारो भवतीति भावः ।"

In the same chapter, Kavikarṇapūra Gosvāmin again states this in clearer language:

बहिरन्तःकरणयोर्व्यापारान्तररोधकम् ।
स्वकारणादिसंश्लेषि चमत्कारि सुखं रसः ॥

अयं तु उत्तमप्रकृतीनाम् अनुकार्याणाम् स्वतस्सिद्ध एव । काव्यादौ तु सामाजिकानामेव । तेषां सर्वरसाभिव्यक्तिशाली **एक एव** पूर्वोक्तः कश्चन आस्वादकन्दः चेतोधर्मविशेषः स्थायी । तत्र युक्तिः दर्शयिष्यते—

रसस्य आनन्दधर्मत्वात् **एकध्यम्**, भाव एव हि ।
उपाधिभेदान्नानात्वम्, रत्यादय उपाधयः ॥

रत्यादयः स्थायिनः यथा नानाविधशरावसलिलतारतम्येऽपि तरणिबिम्बप्रतिबिम्ब एक एव, तथा उपाधिगत एव भेदः, नानन्दगतो रसस्य । Com "आनन्दधर्मत्वात् चरमानन्दरूपत्वात् ऐकध्यमेकविधत्वम् । यथा सितोपलायाः पाकान्तरं नास्ति * * तथा रसस्यापि ।"

INDEX

WORKS AND AUTHORS

SANSKRIT

ENGLISH

SUBJECT INDEX—ENGLISH